DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 858 CS 000 112

AUTHOR Baranoff, Elizabeth S.
TITLE Practices of Teaching Reading by English Teachers in the Junior High Schools of Independent School District No. 1, Tulsa County, Oklahoma.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 109p.; A research paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Professional Diploma in the Dept. of Graduate Study in Education, Graduate School, Univ. of Tulsa

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Content Reading; *English Education; *English Instruction; English Programs; Junior High Schools; *Reading Development; *Reading Instruction; Reading Research; Reading Skills; Secondary School Teachers

ABSTRACT

This study surveyed the practices of teaching reading by English teachers in the 21 Tulsa public junior high schools by means of a 49 item questionnaire distributed to all teachers whose major assignment was English. Questions covered eight aspects of reading instruction: (1) diagnosis of reading ability; (2) provisions for helping retarded readers; (3) development of vocabulary; (4) materials for reading; (5) promotion of interest and taste in reading; (6) instruction for reading nonliterary material; (7) instruction for reading literature; and (8) development of oral reading, speed skills, and creative activities based on reading. Analysis of the results showed that the English teachers were teaching reading to some extent and generally followed prescribed methods for so doing. However, systematic and deliberate teaching of reading was not practiced in most of the respondents' classroom nor did the teachers see reading in the broad communication sense needed to promote necessary growth in all reading skills. The questionnaire and the percentage of respondents for each item choice are in the appendix. (Author/TO)

ED 065858

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TULSA

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PRACTICES OF TEACHING READING BY ENGLISH TEACHERS IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

by
Elizabeth S. Baranoff

A research paper submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of Professional Diploma
in the Department of Graduate Study in Education
The Graduate School
The University of Tulsa
1972

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Elizabeth S. Baranoff

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

THE UNIVERSITY OF TULSA

THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

PRACTICES OF TEACHING READING BY ENGLISH TEACHERS IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS OF INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1, TULSA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

A RESEARCH PAPER

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF

GRADUATE STUDY IN EDUCATION

By Manuscript Committee

Marion McMarket Chairman

Earl Sargent

Warren L. Wigginton Jr.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer would like to recognize the academic instruction of Dr. Marlow A. Markert, the advice and assistance of Marjorie Loris DeFigh, and the cooperation of the participating administrators and teachers of the Tulsa Public Schools; all played a vital part in the formation, development and completion of this paper.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Frequency with Which Three Factors Were Included in Preparing Students to Read Assigned Selections	59
2.	Extent to Which Various Reading Units Were Taught	66
3.	Extent to Which Teachers Emphasized Various Skills in Context of Literature	68

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

APPROVAL PAGE ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES iv

INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter

I. THE DEVELOPMENT OF READING INSTRUCTION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL 3

The Need for Secondary Reading Instruction
Kinds of Secondary Reading Programs
Secondary Reading Instruction by English Teachers
Summary

II. THE PROBLEM AND PROCEDURES 36

III. RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS 43

Provisions for Cooperation and Acceptance of Responsibility for Teaching Reading in the School
Diagnosis of Students' Reading Abilities
Provisions for Helping Retarded Readers
Development of Vocabulary
Materials for Reading
Promotion of Interest and Taste in Reading
Instruction for Reading Non-literary Materials
Instruction for Reading of Literature
Development of Other Aspects -- Creative Application of Reading, Oral Reading, and Speed Skills
Summary

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 73

BIBLIOGRAPHY 78

APPENDIX 90

INTRODUCTION

The need for a developmental program of reading instruction in the secondary schools has been recognized for the last quarter of a century in this country. By developmental program is meant one which provides for a continuation of reading instruction for all students from kindergarten through grade twelve. Many types of developmental programs are now in existence in our public schools, the majority of which offer reading instruction as a separate subject with special reading teachers. One important aspect of these programs, however, is the teaching of reading in subject matter courses, mainly English, and in the schools with no developmental program, this is the only type of reading instruction all students receive. Perusal of the great volume of published research and literature on the teaching of reading reveals little, comparatively speaking, about the teaching of reading in secondary English classes, although this is an emphasis of the English curriculum which the National Council of Teachers of English and various educators and reading experts have been urging for years.[1] Therefore, this study investigates the practices of teaching reading today in the

---

[1] George K. McGuire, The Teaching of Reading by English Teachers in Public High Schools: A National Survey (Washington D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969), p. 1. (Hereinafter referred to as The Teaching of Reading.)

English classes of the junior high schools of the Independent School District No. 1 of Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

Previous to the determination of the specific problem and the development of the study, consideration was given to literature pertaining to the importance of reading, the need for reading instruction in the secondary school, and the growth of a developmental reading program, kindergarten through grade twelve, with emphasis on reading instruction in the English classroom. The findings of this consideration determined the aspects of the surveying instrument used in this study and the analysis of the results. Thus, a summary of this literature is necessary.

CHAPTER I

THE DEVELOPMENT OF READING INSTRUCTION IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL

The Need for Secondary Reading Instruction

To develop in their students proficiency in and liking for reading is both the opportunity and the obligation of the English teacher in the public schools of our country today. The success with which she performs this task is crucial for our society and nation. In an era when interest in reading instruction in our schools is higher than ever before, the right of every child to read as well as his capacity permits has become a major educational goal.[1] Ways in which English teachers in our secondary schools contribute to the achievement of this aim is the subject of this report.

The importance of reading has long been recognized, but its value has increased with the expansion of knowledge and the availability of reading material. Research reveals that reading expertise assists the individual today to achieve satisfactory personality

---

[1] James E. Allen, Jr., "The Right to Read -- Target for the 70's," Journal of Reading, XIII (November, 1969), 94-101.

development, to meet the demands of every-day living, and to achieve success in the academic world.

Authorities in the fields of reading and English define reading as a complex process and advance the concept that learning to read is learning to think. They agree that reading includes not only the ability to decode words on the printed page, but also the ability to comprehend imaginatively the meanings of the words in their context. As the reader asks questions about the material read, relating the concepts therein to those he already has and to his previous experiences, as he comprehends, interprets, evaluates and applies the information that comes to him through decoding, his ability to think develops.[1] McSwain declared, at the Twenty-eighth Annual Conference on Reading in 1965, "Reading is the most productive process by which individuals may develop informed and imaginative minds."[2]

In our literate society, the ability to read well is basic for an individual's satisfactory personality growth, and for the attainment of the developmental tasks necessary for happiness and adjustment.[3] Without consulting scientific research, ready evidence of this truth is found

[1]Russell G. Stauffer, Teaching Reading as a Thinking Process (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969), p. xv.

[2]E. T. McSwain, "The Vital Role of Reading in This Complex Society," Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII (Chicago, 1965), 1.

[3]Paul Witty, "What Experiences, Activities, and Materials Are Helpful in a Developmental Reading Program?" in Reading in the Secondary Schools, ed. by M. Jerry Weiss (New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1961), p. 61.

in accounts describing the happiness of illiterate adults who learn to read through the various present-day literacy programs sponsored by church and government organizations throughout our nation. In addition, the sheer joy of reading with understanding is such that those who have learned to read with depth and mature comprehension wish that all might share their satisfaction. Karlin, one of the leaders in the field of reading, stated, "Although other activities often crowd it aside, reading for recreation, for pure pleasure, has untold value."[1]

Moreover, the demands of this modern world, in which people are constantly bombarded with printed instructions and exhortations,[2] underline the ability to read with skill. Completing advantageously the innumerable tasks of daily living and finding an acceptable place in society are dependent to some degree on the ability to read.[3] If our future citizens are to cope intelligently with the problems of democracy,[4] today's youth need to know how to read so well and want

---

[1]Robert Karlin, Teaching Reading in High School (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1964), p. 4.

[2]Gaspar Cisneros Barnette said that, today, 2,000 pages of material are printed "every minute" in "Reading in the Space Age," Tachist-o-films Manual (Sunland, Calif.: Learning Through Seeing, Inc., Sixth Printing), p. 11.

[3]Karlin, Teaching Reading in High School, pp. 7-8.

[4]Nila Banton Smith, "Reading: Seventy-five Years of Progress," Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-ninth Annual Conference, Reading: Seventy-five Years of Progress, XXVIII (Chicago, 1966), 9.

to read so much that they will continue to read throughout their lives.[1] Thus, for personal development, for pleasure, and for success, reading well is essential.

In the academic world, reading is especially important. It is the foundation stone for success in school and has been so since earliest days in New England when the principal method of instruction was oral reading as the "clergy began to teach reading in churches, and dames began to teach reading in kitchens."[2]

Even today, with the many types of new instructional media, such as tapes, films, television, and teaching machines of various kinds, reading is still the most important tool for the acquisition of knowledge in school and the transmission of our culture to the next generation.[3] Karlin declared, "The relationship of reading ability to scholastic success is not open to dispute; teachers and students alike are aware of it."[4] Contrariwise, lack of competence in this skill is one of the important reasons for students' failures in school. Penty's 1956 study of students with poor reading skills in Battle Creek, Michigan, was one of the first research projects to substantiate this.

---

[1]Walter B. Barbe, "Establishing Goals for Reading Instruction," The Oklahoma Reader, VI (February, 1971), 9.

[2]Nila Banton Smith, "What Have We Accomplished in Reading -- A Review of the Past Fifty Years," in Readings on Reading Instruction, ed. by Albert J. Harris (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963), p. 6. (Hereinafter referred to as "What Have We Accomplished."

[3]Karlin, Teaching Reading in High School, p. 6.

[4]Ibid., p. 4.

The study revealed that more than three times as many poor readers as good readers dropped out before completing high school.[1] The Newman survey of drop-outs, summarized by Blount, disclosed a similar relationship between reading and success in school. The youth who were questioned listed poor reading techniques as the most prevalent reason for quitting school.[2]

As the importance of reading grew more apparent, the need for reading instruction, not only in the elementary school but also in the secondary school, became evident. Educators came to realize that the art of reading is so complex that many children cannot learn all they need to know about reading in six years of school. Davis wrote,

> Reading involves interpreting printed symbols and making discriminating reactions to the ideas expressed by them. The processes of interpreting and making discriminating reactions can be taught and learned only in terms of the ideas expressed by the symbols, i.e.: the content of the reading material.
>
> The elementary school cannot prepare children to read skillfully in all the different subject areas they will meet in high school, college and adult life.[3]

---

[1]Ruth C. Penty, "Reading Ability and High School Drop-outs," in Reading in the Secondary Schools, ed. by M. Jerry Weiss (New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961), pp. 176-80.

[2]Nathan S. Blount, "Summary of Investigations Relating to the English Language Arts in Secondary Education: 1966," English Journal, LVI (May, 1967), 689.

[3]Stanley E. Davis, "High School and College Instructors Can't Teach Reading? Nonsense!" in Teaching Reading: Selected Materials, ed. by Walter B. Barbe (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 305. (Hereinafter referred to as "Can't Teach Reading?")

With the growth of the science of psychology and the study of techniques of learning and child development, research disclosed that at each stage in his growth a child is capable of grasping concepts only in an ascending order of abstraction and difficulty. Hafner described reading materials read by the students in secondary school thus:

> Concepts are more difficult, the sentences and paragraphs become more involved, more figurative language is used, the topics are broader in scope, and purposes for reading in the various subjects become more varied and demanding.[1]

Strang declared that in the junior and senior high school a child must extend and refine the skills learned in elementary school, and make wider use of reading in his search for information in making reports and completing individual projects.[2] He needs reinforcement of skills previously taught in elementary school as well as training in the higher comprehension skills of interpretation, criticism, and application of material read. In the following listing, Gunn enumerated these needs, and this list is representative of summations published by many reading specialists.

> I. VOCABULARY SKILLS: ability to use context clues; to use phonetic and structural analysis; to use the glossary and the dictionary; to use wide reading, to develop and extend word meaning.

---

[1]Lawrence E. Hafner, "Preface," in Improving Reading in Secondary Schools, ed. by Lawrence E. Hafner (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967), p. vii.

[2]Ruth Strang and Dorothy Kendall Bracken, Making Better Readers (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1957), p. 6.

II. COMPREHENSION SKILLS: extension of ability to find and to understand details and main ideas; to relate supporting details to main ideas; to understand sequence of ideas and events.

III. SKILLS FOR STUDYING FACTUAL MATERIALS: ability to define a specific purpose for reading; to adjust the method of reading to one's purpose and to the nature of the material; to locate information; to evaluate, organize, and use information; to remember what is read.

IV. CREATIVE READING SKILLS, skills of a higher order than literal comprehension: ability to draw conclusions and to make inferences; to anticipate events and to predict outcomes; to use in a new situation the ideas gained through reading; to select and use several sources of information in solving a problem; to judge the validity of information in solving a problem; to identify the writer's purpose; to distinguish between the relevant and the irrelevant, the important and the unimportant; to distinguish between cause and effect, and between fact and opinion.

V. SKILLS NEEDED FOR READING LITERATURE, UNDERSTANDING, APPRECIATING:
how literature can develop aesthetic values; how literary situations can be used to understand oneself and one's life; how an author develops plot; how he reveals character; how he reveals time and place; how setting influences plot and character; how characteristics of different literary forms affect the writing and reading of literature; how the reading of literature is expanded by visualizing characters and setting; how it is expanded by "hearing" characters' voices and conversation; the effects of telling a story from different points of view; the use of flashbacks and other time patterns; the importance of foreshadowing clues; the use of descriptive and affective language; the use of symbols and figures of speech; the use of humor, satire, irony; the uses of mood, tone, the "speaking voice," and how the author creates them; the effects of rhythm and rhyme in poetry; types of poetic form; the effectiveness of word sounds in poetry; the enhancement of literature through oral reading; the enjoyment of literature through appreciative listening.[1]

---

[1]Agnella M. Gunn, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal - About Reading and the Teacher of English?" English Journal, LVIII (March, 1969), 373-74. (Hereinafter referred to as "Reading and the Teacher.")

Gunn stated that practices of teaching reading in the secondary school should include these skills and the many sub-skills needed to attain proficiency in them.

As understanding grew concerning the reading skills needed at higher levels, professional publications and research brought to the attention of educators the need for reading instruction in the secondary school. As early as 1925, in the Twenty-fourth Yearbook, [1] and again in the Thirty-sixth Yearbook, [2] the National Committee on Reading of the National Society for the Study of Education made suggestions for the teaching of reading in junior and senior high schools. Strang's studies in secondary reading instruction compiled information up to 1937 about the reading habits of students in secondary schools, and her published reports helped to develop interest in reading abilities at these levels. [3]

Coupled with these scientific discoveries and professional publications came another factor which made reading instruction in

---

[1] National Society for the Study of Education, Report of the National Committee on Reading, 1925, Twenty-fourth Yearbook of the Society, Part I (Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Company, 1925).

[2] National Society for the Study of Education, The Teaching of Reading: A Second Report, 1937, Thirty-sixth Yearbook of the Society, Part I (Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Company, 1937).

[3] Strang, Problems in the Improvement of Reading in High School and College (Lancaster, Pa.: The Science Press, 1938), and Explorations in Reading Patterns (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942), cited by David H. Russell, "Reading Research That Makes A Difference," in Readings on Reading Instruction, ed. by Albert J. Harris (New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 1963), p. 31.

the high school imperative, a change in the school population. It increased rapidly with the advance of the twentieth century. Enrollments in public high schools rose from nine hundred thousand in 1910 to eight million in 1958, and to twelve million in 1965.[1] This increase brought an alteration in the types of students enrolled at these levels. As our society changed, more and more teen-agers attended and graduated from high school each year. Most youths were forced by law to remain in school until they were sixteen or seventeen years of age,[2] and paradoxically, although students were attending school longer, the rate of "functional illiteracy" rose as industry required fewer unskilled laborers.[3]

The public became aware of this educational dilemma during the 40's. Although Spache demonstrated through research that the scholastic attainments of draftees of World War II were much higher than those of World War I,[4] the public was jolted by the "shocking"

---

[1] Paul B. Diederich, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Evaluation in Reading?" English Journal, LVIII (September, 1969), 861. (Hereinafter referred to as "About Evaluation.")

[2] Robert Karlin, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Reading and the High School Student?" English Journal, LVIII (March, 1969), 390.

[3] David Dempsey, "The Right to Read," Saturday Review, April 17, 1971, p. 22.

[4] George D. Spache, "Are We Teaching Reading?" in Readings on Reading Instruction, ed. by Albert J. Harris (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963), p. 27.

discovery that "thousands of young men in the military service could not read well enough to follow the simple printed instructions for camp life."[1] Research conducted in the years following revealed that many children in the secondary school were reading over two years below their actual grade level. Typical of these findings was one by Kottmeyer. In 1944, he conducted a survey of 7,380 eighth graders in St. Louis and found that 2,169 of those tested were reading at or below national norms for the sixth grade.[2] As the volume of research on secondary reading increased steadily in the following decades,[3] more and more studies showed conditions similar to those in St. Louis in the 40's. One study by Ramsey, 1962, a survey of reading abilities among eighth grade students in Kentucky, disclosed the reading level of those tested to be far below national norms.[4] In 1965, a study showed that at least three million young people, in grades seven through twelve, were being given books of American, English and world literature which they could not read.[5] Aukerman

---

[1]Smith, "What Have We Accomplished," p. 11.

[2]William Kottmeyer, "Improving Reading Instruction in the St. Louis Schools," Elementary School Journal, XLV (September, 1944), 33-38.

[3]Edward G. Summers, "Reading in the Secondary School," Review of Educational Research, XXXVII (April, 1967) p. 145.

[4]Wallace Ramsey, "The Kentucky Reading Study," The Reading Teacher, XVI (December, 1962), 178-81.

[5]Allen F. Muskopf, and H. Alan Robinson, "High School Reading -- 1965," Journal of Reading, X (November, 1966), 75.

averred, in evaluating these texts, "This is not the fault of the books .. It is probable that 'literature' anthologies designed specifically for 'functional non-readers of literature' are necessary."[1] In 1971, Dempsey reported,

> An estimated three million adults are totally illiterate. Another twenty-five million job holders have "reading deficiencies ... serious enough to deny them advancement." Five million young people are unable to read well enough to qualify for most types of employment.[2]

Along with the discovery of the presence of students in public high schools markedly deficient in reading skills, came the discovery that some superior students were also deficient. Although most of the surveys dealt with below-average students, some included superior students as well. Surprisingly, these, too, were found to be in need of reading instruction. One study in New York City, in 1955, showed that 42.3 per cent of those tested were reading below expectancy when reading levels revealed by the tests were compared with mental ability test scores.[3] Caldwell reported that a study to investigate the impact of the high school advanced placement programs on college teaching disclosed that professors found that students had

---

[1]Robert C. Aukerman, "Readability of Secondary School Literature Textbooks: A First Report," English Journal, LVI (September, 1965), 540, quoted in Gunn, "Reading and the Teacher," p. 377.

[2]Dempsey, "The Right to Read," pp. 22-23.

[3]Lawrence E. Hafner, "The Uses of Reading and the Need for Reading Instruction," in Improving Reading in Secondary Schools, ed. by Lawrence E. Hafner (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967), pp. 10-11.

"superficial knowledge of words read; immature literary judgment."[1] Marksheffel affirmed, "Much available evidence indicates that many college and university students are reading well below their capabilities and needs."[2]

In addition to the below-average and superior students, reading deficiencies were found among the average students. As pointed out previously, all students, even the average ones, needed instruction in the more mature reading skills to master the textbooks and reference materials in the secondary content subjects and to read critically the more complex forms of literature.

Thus, the need for reading instruction in the secondary schools came to be accepted. "The demand for higher levels of reading maturity to meet adult needs is forcing the extension of the developmental reading program into the junior and senior high school levels."[3] This statement was made by Artly in 1964.

---

1 Margueritte J. Caldwell, "Who Speaks for Reading?" English Journal, LVI (February, 1967), 247.

2 Ned. D. Marksheffel, Better Reading in the Secondary School (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1966), p. 48. (Hereinafter referred to as Better Reading.)

3 A. Sterl Artley, "Educating Teachers for Secondary Reading Instruction," International Reading Association. Proceedings of the Annual Convention, Improvement of Reading through Classroom Practices, IX (Newark, 1964), 20.

Kinds of Secondary Reading Programs

Summers declared, "The why of secondary programs has become obvious; now we must answer the what and how."[1] As reading instruction was introduced into the secondary curriculum, there were about as many different kinds of programs as there were schools providing them.[2] Harris wrote, "The most typical organizational structure in the high school and college in the United States is the formation of special classes ... created for reading assistance."[3] These special classes are of three types: remedial, for students reading two or more levels below their actual grade levels; corrective, for lesser retarded students with problems; and developmental, for other students who could profit from reading instruction.[4] They may comprise a separate department or be a part of the English department; they may be given in addition to, or in place of, the regular English instruction.[5] They may be offered on a voluntary or

---

[1]Summers, "New Developments in High-School and College Reading," Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII (Chicago: 1965), 88. (Hereinafter referred to as "New Developments.")

[2]Karlin, Teaching Reading in High School, p. 259.

[3]Albert J. Harris, "Reading," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 4th ed., 1969, p. 1087.

[4]Strang and Bracken, Making Better Readers, pp. 107-10.

[5]The one junior high school in Tulsa having a developmental reading program in 1969-70 offered special reading classes to all students, in addition to the regular English class, the school having seven class periods a day instead of the usual six.

compulsory basis. They may last for varying portions of a single year, for a single year, or for a number of years.[1] They may be taught by the English teachers or by reading teachers.

From the first, the efforts to solve the reading problem at higher educational levels consisted of instituting separate reading classes for corrective instruction, and this solution continues to be the most prevalent one today. Early's declaration that there has been great growth in the amount of reading instruction at the higher levels of education but not much change of direction,[2] is substantiated by research. In the 1942 National Education Research Bulletin, 50 per cent of the schools surveyed gave help to retarded readers, but only 25 per cent gave help to all students.[3] In the 60's, as federal funds under NDEA were dispensed through the state departments of education for the improvement of reading instruction, most of this money was used to finance remedial reading programs, first in the elementary schools and then in the secondary schools. Simmons, in 1963, reported on reading practices in a five state area of the Upper

---

[1]In 1969-70, English teachers in the tenth grade of one Tulsa high school took their classes into the reading lab for six weeks of instruction during the year. The teachers were prepared to give this instruction in in-service training.

[2]Margaret J. Early, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Successful Reading Programs?" English Journal, LVIII (April, 1969), 535. (Hereinafter referred to as "What Does Research Reveal?")

[3]National Education Association, Research Bulletin, Reading Instruction in Secondary Schools, XX (January, 1942), 8.

Midwest; 33 per cent of the high schools of the sample had no reading programs of any kind, and those who had programs reported them to be very limited, usually remedial.[1] Graham found, in response to questionnaires sent to each California District, 78 per cent had reading programs, of which 75 per cent were less than five years old; these programs were primarily organized as special reading classes.[2] Smith and Austin's investigations of the effects of the Title I programs, in 1970, in which they surveyed six hundred thirty-two school systems, disclosed that more than half had remedial programs, 30 per cent had combined programs of some sort, and 66 per cent of the systems had programs of reading instruction extending from kindergarten through grade twelve, mostly in special classes.[3]

The efficacy of these separate reading classes is open to question. Early asserted that the reading problems were not solved by the practice of "creating extra reading classes that isolate skills instruction from the learning of subject matter."[4] Gray's summaries of research showed little transfer of general reading skills from

---

[1]John S. Simmons, "The Scope of the Reading Program for Secondary Schools," The Reading Teacher, XVII (September, 1963), 34.

[2]H. V. Graham, "Present Practices in Reading Programs in Secondary Schools in California," Journal of Reading, XII (April, 1969), 564.

[3]C. B. Smith and Mary C. Austin, "Conducting a National Study of Title I Reading Programs," Reading Research Quarterly, IV-2 (Winter, 1969), 323-41.

[4]Early, "Skills Development in the English Curriculum" (Unpublished), quoted in Gunn, "Reading and the Teacher," p. 374.

separate skills instruction to the reading of specific subject matter materials.[1] However, Harris alleged that if implementation of these skills is given in the subject matter classes, the results are "consistently favorable."[2]

If implementation is to be given in the subject matter courses, reading instruction must be a part of each academic class. Thus, another solution to the reading problem is presented -- a developmental program with reading instruction for all students in all academic classes. A very real deterrent to such a program is immediately apparent. Many subject matter teachers say that they do not have time to teach both reading skills and their disciplines. Reading experts have answered this assertion with the allegation that teaching reading along with the subject matter makes the use of the time available more efficient. Karlin stated that one of the best ways to teach content is to help students to master the content through reading.[3] Additionally, such teaching is very valuable. According to Covert, it has immediate reference to the students' school work and has meaning for them as it becomes "a useful tool of learning."[4]

---

[1]Gray, "Reading," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, 3rd ed., 1960, pp. 1126-28.

[2]Harris, "Reading", p. 1092.

[3]Karlin, Teaching Reading in High School, p. 231.

[4]Marshall Covert, "Enlisting Faculty-Wide Cooperation for Improvement of Reading Skills in Senior High School," in Reading in the Secondary Schools, ed. by M. Jerry Weiss (New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1961), p. 35.

Although the first solution to the reading problem was formation of special classes, the first writings advocating the incorporation of reading instruction into the secondary school curriculum contained recommendations for a developmental reading program, as well as special reading classes. As mentioned previously, this kind of program provides for the "infusion of reading skills instruction into all school subjects where reading is an important mode of learning."[1] In 1948, Part II of the Forty-seventh Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education was devoted entirely to reading instruction in the high school and college. Members of the yearbook committee cited the need for promoting maximum reading growth among all students in the secondary school, in keeping with their capacities and needs.[2] Another publication, The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, published in 1950, was concerned solely with the subject of improving reading in the secondary school and contained recommendations for developmental as well as remedial instruction.[3] This same year, the Conant Report

---

[1]Early, "What Does Research Reveal?" p. 535.

[2]National Society for the Study of Education, Reading in the High School and College, 1948, Forty-seventh Yearbook of the Society, Part II, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948).

[3]National Association of Secondary-School Principals, The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, Improving Reading Instruction in the Secondary School, XXXIV (February, 1950).

recommended special consideration for the very slow reader in high school and also stated, "Those who are well informed about the teaching of reading emphasize that the development of reading skill must be a continuous process throughout the school years."[1] The model program described by Gray, in 1948, included provisions for the teaching of reading by all subject matter teachers in high school, as well as remedial instruction.[2] Since that time, other reading authorities have outlined developmental reading programs for the secondary school,[3] and most of these included similar provisions. As late as 1969, Harris wrote, in the introduction to his summary of reading research, that the developmental concept for the organization of reading instruction in the secondary school

> implies organizational provisions for the continued reading growth of all pupils commensurate with their ability and the acceptance of such responsibility by all teachers who use reading material as a basis of instruction.[4]

---

[1] James R. Conant, The American High School Today (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959), p. 56. On pages 67 and 68, he also recommended specific developmental reading programs.

[2] Gray, "Nature and Scope of a Sound Reading Program," National Society for the Study of Education, Reading in the High School and College, 1948, Forty-seventh Yearbook of the Society, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948). pp. 46-67.

[3] Marksheffel, Karlin, and Strang and Bracken, in their textbooks on teaching reading in secondary schools, listed in the bibliography, describe similar developmental reading programs.

[4] Harris, "Reading," p. 1087.

Throughout the history of reading instruction in the secondary schools, the recommendation has been to establish a developmental reading program; the response has been to form a remedial program with special reading classes. And the situation remains unchanged. Harris wrote,

> There is no substantial evidence ... that the administrations and staffs of the high school and the college ... have caught the full implication of the developmental concept for the organization of reading instruction ... The existing organizational policy ... is not designed to meet the developmental needs of its population.[1]

In spite of the fact that fifty states now have reading supervisors for grades K through 12[2] only in Pennsylvania is every secondary school teacher required to take a course in the teaching of reading before he can be certified to teach in the public schools.[3]

Secondary Reading Instruction by English Teachers

Although the model developmental reading program is seldom realized, some reading instruction is being given in the secondary schools outside of the special reading classes, and it seems likely that most of the instruction supplied occurs in the English classes. Such was the case reported in The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, mentioned earlier in this chapter, in

---

[1]Harris, "Reading," p. 1087.

[2]Early, "What Does Research Reveal?" p. 534.

[3]Summers, "New Developments," p. 87.

which two major types of reading programs were described, developmental and remedial; Rogers stated therein that the English teacher usually carried the major responsibility for the developmental reading instruction.[1] Simmons reported in 1963, that in the secondary school, the English teacher most often was responsible for the teaching of reading.[2] Cawelti, in 1962, reported that of the forty-two high schools visited, twenty-seven had reading improvement instruction in addition to the incidental reading taught in the regular classrooms, and that twenty-one of these had such instruction provided during the regular class period, usually English.[3] Fair, Laffey and Brown reported that of the five hundred fifty junior and senior high schools in Indiana whose administrations were questioned, three-fourths had required reading courses, with the basic responsibility usually assigned to the English teacher.[4] Since each student in each year of high school is usually required to study

---

[1] Helen Jewett Rogers, "Introduction," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, Improving Reading Instruction in the Secondary School, XXXIV (February, 1950), 5.

[2] Simmons, "Who is Responsible? The Need for Qualified Supervision of Reading Programs," English Journal, LII (February 1963), 93. (Hereinafter referred to as "Who is Responsible?")

[3] Gordon L. Cawelti, "Reading Improvement Programs in Selected Midwestern High Schools," The Reading Teacher, XVII (September, 1963), p. 36.

[4] Roger Farr, James Laffey, and Rexel Brown, "Secondary Reading Programs in Indiana: Status and Needs," Journal of Reading, XIII (January, 1970), 269-74, 317-19.

English, it seems logical to conclude that developmental instruction can be provided to all students in the English classes. However, most of the research giving information about the teaching of reading by English teachers describes programs in which blocks of time are given specifically to the teaching of reading skills, either in the English classroom or in the reading labs, under the supervision of reading specialists. Such programs have the advantage of providing in-service training in teaching techniques for the faculty,[1] and usually lead to continued reading instruction in English in connection with the reading of literature. However, unless students are guided in the use of the skills learned in "crash" programs, the value of such programs is questionable. Many reading teachers complain that, after they have brought a poor reader up to grade level and returned him to the regular English classroom, he often drops back into unproductive habits and becomes a repeater. This opens the question concerning the competency of the secondary English teacher to teach reading.

Some authorities have stated, as did Davis; "An instructor does not need to be an expert in the teaching of reading in order to help students read better and at the same time cover course content."[2]

---

[1] Summers, "Reading in the Secondary School," p. 136.

[2] Davis, "Can't Teach Reading?" p. 309.

Many educators have felt that the teaching of reading should come easily to English teachers because reading is a component part of the "language arts constellation,"[1] and is interwoven with the other aspects of the English curriculum, listening, speaking, and writing.[2] Additionally, they have believed that English teachers know better than anyone else the importance of reading and the needs of their students.[3] However, other authorities have taken the opposite view. Simmons declared that the English teacher is the most poorly equipped of all the secondary teachers to teach reading because he almost always is an excellent reader himself; he enjoys literature and has little remembrance of how he learned to read it.[4] In addition, being a good reader, he often has difficulty understanding poor readers and sympathizing with their problems.[5] In 1963, many English teachers themselves supported this latter view. A report of the Committee on National Interest published by the National Council of Teachers of

---

[1]Smith, "What Have We Accomplished," p. 12.

[2]Muriel Crosby, "Interrelationships of Reading and the Other Language Arts," Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-sixth Annual Conference, Reading and the Language Arts, XXV (Chicago, 1963), p. 23.

[3]Elizabeth A. Simpson, Helping High-School Students Read Better (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1954), p. 19.

[4]Simmons, "Who is Responsible?" p. 88.

[5]Henry A. Bamman, Ursula Hogan, and Charles E. Greene, Reading Instruction in the Secondary Schools (New York: Longmans Green and Company, 1961), p. 168.

English, in 1964, disclosed that as high as 90 per cent of the English teachers who were members of that professional organization did not consider themselves well prepared to teach reading.[1]

In addition to believing they are not qualified, many English teachers feel, as in the past, that it is the job of the elementary teacher to teach reading; it is not their responsibility. Some justification for this belief may be found in the history of the teaching of English as a separate content field. The aspect of reading in the secondary English curriculum, throughout the years, has been alternately emphasized and slighted. In the late 50's, the Curriculum Committee of the National Council of Teachers of English recognized and outlined the reading skills to be taught in connection with the teaching of literature, thus emphasizing the reading aspect of English. In 1959, the Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board defined the curriculum in terms of language, literature, and composition, with decreasing emphasis on teaching the supporting skills, including reading. When English was added to the subject courses to receive federal help under the NDEA, once again the reading skills were emphasized. Today, although the definition of the English program remains fluid, it includes both content (language,

---

[1] Committee on National Interest, Report of the Committe, The National Interest and the Teaching of English (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1964), p. 13, cited by McGuire in The Teaching of Reading, p. 7.

literature, and composition) and the skills needed in the communication arts (reading, writing, speaking, and listening).[1]

Albeit hesitatingly, many English teachers in the secondary schools are accepting the responsibility for reading instruction.[2] Such acceptance is stimulated partly by the fact they are faced daily with large numbers of students who are reluctant to read and who frequently disappoint them by apathetic responses to the literature assigned,[3] and partly by the fact that they are bombarded continually with written and verbal proof of the need for reading instruction in high school. Since they feel unqualified and perhaps reluctant to teach reading,[4] and yet are doing so to some extent, educators wonder how effective such instruction is. Ascertaining an answer to the worth of instruction in reading is "complicated" and more difficult to obtain than is ascertaining answers to other questions regarding "more specific aspects of reading instruction."[5] Little research is available on the efficacy of teaching the various aspects of reading in secondary English classes, although much is available on

---

[1]Gunn, "Reading and the Teacher," pp. 369-73.

[2]McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, p. 21.

[3]Caldwell, "Who Speaks for Reading?" pp. 246-47.

[4]Ramon Royal Ross stated that asking English teachers to teach reading is like "asking Van Cliburn to repair pianos" in "... Of Reading," Convention Concerns ... 1970. Report of the Sixtieth Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English (Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970), p. 23.

[5]Harris, "Reading," p. 1084.

similar instruction in reading classes and in elementary school.[1] A few studies have disclosed successful secondary reading programs in English classes with varying organizational patterns. In 1946, Weeks reported on the effects of a "broadside attack" to teach students to read better in the English classes in the freshman and sophomore years of the Paseo High School in Kansas City, Missouri. She stated that the freshmen were "lifted" two years in reading skill in one year.[2] Strang described the teaching of reading skills in two vocational high school English classes in New York City as being incidental or casual rather than conscious and systematic. Nonetheless, the instruction covered all the necessary reading skills and was successful because of the skillful efforts of the teachers to develop

---

[1] Summers, in "Reading in the Secondary School," previously cited, predicted the one thousand research studies dealing with reading at the secondary level in the fifties would more than double in the sixties. His prediction was realized, although most of these studies dealt with processes and practices of reading instruction in special reading classes. Harris, in his article, "Reading," wrote that research in the teaching of reading, especially that done in recent years, "exceeds by far" research in other aspects of reading. Donald L. Cleland declared "research on reading instruction comprises more space in magazines, journals, books, encyclopedias, etc., than in any other area of education" in "Needed Improvement in Research Design in Reading," International Reading Association. Proceedings of the Annual Convention, Improvement of Reading through Classroom Practices, IX (Newark, 1964), 244.

[2] Ruth Mary Weeks, "Nature and Extent of Reading in Content Fields in Secondary Schools in Literature," Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Eighth Annual Conference, Improving Reading in Content Fields, VIII (Chicago, 1946), 22.

good attitudes toward reading along with the skills instruction.[1] Martin reported on reinvestigations after five years of the reading program in the Upper Midwest mentioned earlier, and found reason for "cautious optimism." Using a questionnaire developed from a model of a theoretically sound reading program, Martin found that the shift of emphasis had been from remedial to teaching of reading in the content areas, with most of it integrated into English classes.[2] In Centinela Valley, California, a school district with four high schools, all ninth-grade English classes spent eight weeks in the reading laboratories, with the regularly assigned English teacher taking half his class in one laboratory, and the reading teacher taking the other half in the second. During this time the classes had concentrated drill on reading and study skills. Tests to check the effectiveness of this program showed an average gain of 1.8 years, during the year 1959-60.[3]

Although in most of these programs the English teachers had the assistance of reading specialists, their reading instruction proved effective. However, as Karlin stated, " ... it is unrealistic to expect

---

[1]Strang, "Teaching Reading, An Essential Part of Teaching English," in Reading in the Secondary School, ed. by M. Jerry Weiss (New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961), pp. 352-56.

[2]William R. Martin, "A New Look at Secondary School Reading Programs in the Upper Midwest," Journal of Reading, XII (March, 1969), 467-70, 512-13.

[3]Sally Berkey and Irwin H. Fields, "Reading and Study Skills Program," Journal of Secondary Education, XXXVI (April, 1961), 197-202.

the English teacher or the reading expert to teach all the needed reading skills. A total reading program demands the cooperation and work of everyone."[1] Probably, Strang's observation that schools should "avoid the two extremes: neglect of teaching reading in English classes and giving English teachers the sole responsibility for reading instruction,"[2] is correct.

How much instruction in reading skills is being given to students in regular English classes is difficult to ascertain. However, two national surveys recently published reveal some answers to this question. In the first, Squire and Applebee examined English classes in one hundred fifty-eight high schools in forty-five different states[3] by means of observation, interviews, questionnaires, and check-lists. They found that reading received little attention in most of the schools. Of the English departments surveyed, 50 per cent accepted the responsibility for the teaching of reading but 33 per cent felt such instruction was the task of the reading teacher or reading program.[4] Even though the departments felt this responsibility, only 4.5 per cent of the class time was spent in the teaching of reading, and 1.3 per cent in instruction pertaining to mass media.[5] Many teachers, when questioned,

---

[1]Karlin, Teaching Reading in High School, p. 260.

[2]Strang and Bracken, Making Better Readers, p. 204.

[3]James R. Squire and Roger K. Applebee, High School English Instruction Today (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968), p. 3, 265-74.

[4]Ibid., p. 153. [5]Ibid., p. 40.

said that they taught reading every time they opened their anthologies,[1] and 52 per cent of the class time was spent in the teaching of literature.[2] However, Squire and Applebee stated that the teachers were teaching literature but not the reading of literature; they were not teaching the skills needed to read various types of literature as well as a single piece of writing. They were failing to "help readers bring to bear on a literary text all of their critical awareness and discernment, their powers of perception, their values, their emotional and intellectual commitments."[3] Teachers were observed to say that they did not need to teach reading more specifically than they were so doing, but twelfth graders, when filling out questionnaires, listed reading instruction as one of their unmet needs.[4] The authors listed inadequate teaching of reading as one of the four major areas of weakness in the English course content.[5] They stated,

> Although half of the schools have a reading specialist on their staffs, usually as part of the English department, observers could find little evidence of the effect of such specialists. Most teachers either regard reading as quite unrelated to the work which they do in the classroom or are sure that they "teach it all the time" without needing to provide any special programs or careful sequence. Few schools distinguish between the special problems of the slow reader and the needs of the average or advanced student; even fewer have made effective use of the often considerable quantity of special reading materials and mechanical aids which have been purchased in initial bursts of enthusiasm.[6]

---

[1] Squire and Applebee, High School English Instruction Today, p. 153.

[2] Ibid., p. 119. [3] Ibid., p. 107. [4] Ibid., p. 155.

[5] Ibid., p. 52. [6] Ibid., p. 257.

In conclusion, Squire and Applebee found the reading program on the high school level "inadequate, uncoordinated, and almost non-existent."[1]

In the second national study, McGuire suggested that the severe judgment of the high school reading programs by the foregoing authors was partially unjustified and that the data of his study called "that judgment into some question, but only to a quite limited extent."[2] The teachers questioned in the McGuire survey taught in junior and senior high schools throughout the country, and were members of the National Council of Teachers of English. Although the thrust of the study was on teacher preparation rather than practices, a portion of the questions on the surveying instrument pertained to practices of teaching reading. McGuire made the following comment on teachers' practices in teaching reading:

> In the writer's opinion, the findings of this study concerning the practices in teaching reading of the English teachers in the public high schools of the country present, certainly not a completely bright picture, but also certainly not a completely dark one. This is true especially of the findings set forth ... pertaining to the teaching of reading units, and ... pertaining to the development of reading skills in the context of teaching literature. Poorly prepared though they have been for their task of reading instruction, most English teachers are striving to accomplish it.[3]

---

[1] Squire and Applebee, High School English Instruction Today, p. 257.

[2] McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, p. 33.

[3] Ibid.

A brief, rough estimate of specific findings are of interest, since similar questions were included in the questionnaire of this present study, results of which are outlined in the third chapter. Aspects of the reading art explored were vocabulary, types of materials taught, teaching techniques, teaching of study and speed skills, teaching of skills needed for informational reading and for literary reading. The percentages here given are rounded to the closest multiple of five, for convenience. Almost 70 per cent emphasized word study; 85 per cent vocabulary development;[1] 50 per cent used materials designed specifically for the teaching of reading skills; 85 per cent used paper-backs; 25 per cent used inventories of their students' interests as a basis for choosing materials to be read.[2] Approximately 40 per cent grouped their students for reading instruction occasionally or regularly;[3] 40 per cent had taught a unit on study skills;[4] 15 per cent emphasized speed of reading;[5] 95 per cent reported that their schools offered a course in library usage during the first year of the school.[6] Determination of teaching of skills needed for reading informational types of materials was made in terms of types of units taught by the respondents during their last five years of teaching. More than 70 per cent of the sample stated that they had taught units on news media and critical reading of non-fiction prose;

---

[1] McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, p. 31. [2] Ibid., p. 32.
[3] Ibid., p. 81. [4] Ibid., p. 28. [5] Ibid., p. 31. [6] Ibid., p. 33.

55 per cent, units on propaganda analysis and semantics.[1] Slightly more than 80 per cent of the teachers declared that they did most of their teaching of reading in their teaching of literature,[2] and more than 80 per cent of these said that they attempted to develop in their students the ability to determine the author's purpose, tone, and theme; 75 per cent, the ability to determine voice and implied meanings; and 60 per cent taught aspects of poetry.[3] Thus, the findings revealed that these teachers throughout the country were, to varying degrees, teaching reading in their English classes. McGuire stated in his conclusions, "Despite the great deficiencies in programs preparing English teachers to teach reading in the high school, numerous teachers are engaging in recommended practices in reading instruction."[4]

Aside from these two national studies, the literature examined revealed little specific practices of teaching reading in regular English classes. Some studies, described previously, revealed results of reading instruction in English and other subject matter classes. Professional publications have long contained articles by English and reading teachers at the secondary level, describing practices of teaching certain reading skills in the reading of specific pieces of literature. McCullough described many specific skills being

---

[1] McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, p. 28.

[2] Ibid., p. 29. [3] Ibid., p. 30. [4] Ibid. p. 70.

taught with specific selections of literature.[1] However, most articles have dealt only with one selection or type of literature, such as the article by Bivins, "How to Read a Victorian Novel."[2] Many of these articles described practices followed by teachers who were teaching the reading of literature, rather than teaching literature. In reading a single Shakespearean play, they prepared students to read other Shakespearean plays, as Squire and Applebee recommended.[3]

Summary

This chapter has presented in some detail the history and present status of the developmental reading program in the secondary school. During this century, the increase in the importance of reading has brought with it the need for reading instruction in high school. The type of program recommended was a developmental program providing the necessary instruction for all students according to their abilities and capacities, from grade seven through grad twelve. However, the story of the growth of reading instruction in the upper grades revealed the provisions for such instruction to be, in the main,

---

[1]Constance M. McCullough, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Practices in Teaching Reading?" English Journal, LVIII (May, 1969), 688-706.

[2]Betty M. Bivins, "How to Read a Victorian Novel," in Improving Reading in Secondary Schools, ed. by Lawrence E. Hafner (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967) pp. 362-67.

[3]Squire and Applebee, High School English Instruction Today, p. 156.

remedial. Much of the burden of the minimal developmental instruction has fallen upon the secondary English teachers. Research has disclosed little concerning the actual practices of teaching reading in the English classes. As Strang asked, "Who knows what goes on behind the closed doors of classrooms all over the country? Many sound procedures were first advocated decades ago, but just how prevalent they are we do not know."[1] The little information available indicates that many English teachers are attempting to teach reading in their secondary classrooms, to varying degrees. The following chapters give answers to some questions as to how they do this in the Tulsa public junior high schools.

---

[1]Strang, "Present Status of Reading Instruction," in Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII (Chicago, 1965), 206.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEM AND PROCEDURES

This study is designed to determine the practices of English teachers in teaching reading, the things they do and the extent to which they do them. The specific problem may be stated as follows: What are English teachers doing, in practice, to teach reading in their English classes in the junior high schools of Independent School District No. 1 of Tulsa County, Oklahoma.

As presented in Chapter I, authorities in the field of reading and secondary education have with increasing urgency advocated adoption of developmental reading programs for all students, extending from kindergarten through grade twelve. The model programs developed by experts include reading instruction in all content areas, and remedial and corrective classes for those who need special instruction. Such programs are rare, however. Throughout the growth of reading instruction in the secondary schools, English has been the subject matter most generally accepted as the one in which such instruction is given. This is logical since reading is a part of the language arts normally taught by English teachers, and English is one subject required of most students in almost all grades of high school.

In Tulsa high schools, the only reading instruction, outside the special reading classes, which students receive is in the English classes where teachers report that in their teaching of literature they teach specific reading skills and practices. This study purports to explore these practices.

The design of this study may be presented as follows. The junior high English teachers in the Tulsa Public Schools were asked questions concerning their practices of instruction relating to various aspects of the teaching of reading. To gain the desired information presented several difficulties. There is little agreement as to what practices of instruction actually help children to read adequately, since individuals learn differently, and opinions vary among reading specialists on which specific reading skills need to be taught in the secondary schools and how they need to be taught. Nonetheless, the following areas were chosen for exploration: word control skills, including decoding techniques and vocabulary building; comprehension skills, including the more mature skills of interpretation, evaluation, and application; and study and speed skills. Techniques and materials used to foster these skills and to promote favorable attitudes toward the reading act were also to be ascertained.

A questionnaire, distributed by mail, was selected as the method of survey because of the difficulties and cost of individual interviews and observations. The limitations of this device in obtaining the desired information were kept in mind throughout its preparation and

dissemination. To insure the largest possible unbiased response, it was decided to mail the questionnaires to the English department chairmen in each school for distribution to the teachers, with provision for their return directly to the writer by mail. The purpose of the study was outlined in detail to the chairmen; a brief statement of purpose and instructions for completing and returning the form were included in the questionnaire itself.

The information necessary for the selection of the teachers was gathered from the mimeographed list, "Junior High School English Teachers for the Year 1970-1971, Tulsa Public Schools." The list was brought up-to-date with the assistance of Dorothy Knappenberger, English Supervisor of the Tulsa Public Schools. Next, all teachers whose main teaching assignment was English (those who taught at least five hours of English a day) were selected. One hundred thirteen teachers were included in this category.

The questionnaire used in this study consisted of forty-nine items designed to elicit information concerning practices of teaching reading in junior high school. It was based on the instrument used by Dr. George McGuire in his study, The Teaching of Reading by English Teachers in Public High Schools: A National Survey.[1] Additional questions were formulated with the help and advice of

---

[1]McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, pp. 75-86. In the instrument used in this study, nineteen questions (Nos. 5, 23, 25, 32-37, 39-48) were similar to items in the McGuire questionnaire.

Marjorie Loris Defigh, Associate Professor of the University of Tulsa. A trial edition was administered to the junior high teachers in the Bristow Public Schools through the offices of Caroline Foster, English Supervisor, Bristow High School. These teachers were asked to answer the questions and note which, if any, they found ambiguous or difficult to understand, and which, if any, they preferred not to answer. Additional comments concerning the instrument were invited. Based on their suggestions, the questionnaire was revised to reach its final form.[1]

The majority of the questions included in the instrument purported to disclose the extent to which English teachers in Tulsa were teaching or reinforcing elementary reading skills, as well as the higher skills needed in secondary schools and colleges, and the extent to which they were fostering growth in reading itself. However, Questions 1, 2 and 3 delineated characteristics of the respondents and of their schools. What specific practices of teaching reading were covered by the remaining forty-six questions may best be made clear by reference to the questionnaire itself and to the analysis of the findings which follow this chapter. Briefly, Questions 4, 5 and 10 referred to provisions for teacher cooperation in the school reading program; the remaining questions revealed information concerning various aspects of reading instruction, as follows: three items on diagnosis of students'

---

[1] Presented in the Appendix.

reading abilities, three on provisions for helping retarded readers, four on development of vocabulary, four on selection of materials for reading, nine items on promotion of interest and taste in reading, seven on instruction for reading informational materials, ten on instruction for reading literature, and three items on other aspects not previously covered.

Every effort was made to structure the questionnaire carefully, to state the questions in simple, clear language, to focus on specific points, and to offer as wide a list of alternate choices in replying as possible. In order to standardize the answers of the respondents, no provision was made for individual comments. The anonymity of respondents was made possible by requesting each teacher not to sign the instrument and to return it in the stamped, addressed envelope provided.

A proposal for this study outlining objectives and planned procedures, together with a copy of the questionnaire to be used, was mailed to the Superintendent of Schools of the Tulsa Public Schools, with a request for permission to conduct the study in the junior high schools of Tulsa. Permission was granted.

Copies of the questionnaire were mailed on April 26, 1971, to the English chairmen of the twenty-one junior high schools in Tulsa with a personal, hand-written note asking that the enclosed copies be delivered to the English teachers whose major assignment was English.

A list of these teachers in each school was included with the note; a stamped envelope addressed to the sender was attached to each questionnaire. Respondents were directed to answer the questions on the questionnaire as previously described. On May 11, a follow-up letter was sent to the department chairmen, enclosing slips to be given to all teachers contacted, asking them to complete and return the questionnaires if they had not already done so. June 1, 1971, was chosen as the final cut-off date, since the Tulsa Public Schools closed on May 27. By that date 82 per cent of the questionnaires had been returned, ninety-two of the one hundred thirteen teachers surveyed.

Information about these teachers was revealed by the first three questions of the surveying instrument. Eighty-six, or 93 per cent, taught in schools with enrollments between 499 and 2000, as follows: forty-five in schools with 500 to 999, forty-one in schools with 1000 to 2000. Four taught in smaller schools and two did not answer this question. The respondents' assignments were quite evenly divided among grades, as follows: twenty-nine taught seventh; twenty, eighth; and twenty-five, ninth. Eighteen taught more than one grade with seven teaching seventh and eighth; nine, eighth and ninth; and one, seventh and ninth. One taught all three grades. Concerning their teaching experience, sixty-six teachers, or 73 per cent, had taught more than three years, as follows: twenty-two, over ten years; twenty-three, seven to ten years; and twenty-three, four to six years.

One had taught only one year; twenty-one, from two to three years. Thus, the majority of the junior high English teachers who replied were experienced teachers.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter presents an analysis of the responses of the teachers concerning their practices of teaching reading in their English classes.[1] The questions, as explained in Chapter II, fall into nine areas relating to the following aspects of reading instruction: (1) provisions for cooperation and acceptance of responsibility for teaching reading in the school, (2) diagnosis of students' reading abilities, (3) provisions for helping retarded readers, (4) development of vocabulary, (5) materials for reading, (6) promotion of interest and taste in reading, (7) instruction for reading of non-literary materials, (8) instruction for reading of literature, (9) development of other aspects -- creative application of reading, oral reading, and speed skills. In each area the percentages of the various responses to the questions are presented, in addition to a brief commentary concerning the implications of these responses. The order of the questions in the questionnaire is not always the same as the order of the aspects

---

[1]The appended questionnaire shows the teachers' responses to each question, in numbers or percentages.

stated above. In this discussion of the findings, therefore, it is sometimes necessary to deviate from the sequence in the questionnaire in order to draw together responses pertaining to the same central point.

Provisions for Cooperation and Acceptance of Responsibility for Teaching Reading in the School

This section involves three questions, Numbers 4, 5, and 10, concerning the cooperative faculty efforts in the respondents' schools to provide reading instruction for all students, the objective of a developmental reading program as described in Chapter I. In the first, Question 4, teachers were asked whether or not, in their schools, consultations on reading were held between teachers of English and teachers of other disciplines. Responses revealed that in none of the schools to which the teachers were assigned were consultations on reading held "Regularly." Thirty-six per cent of the respondents reported that such consultations were "Never" held, 32 per cent that they were held "Rarely," and 32 per cent that they were held "Occasionally." In Question 5, respondents were asked how frequently, in English departmental meetings, there was preplanned and systematic discussion of the reading program of their schools. Two per cent reported that they "Did not know"; 13 per cent, that the "English department met so infrequently that this point was not very meaningful"; 41 per cent that such discussion was "Rarely or never"

held. Only 19 per cent reported that such discussion was held frequently enough "to justify considering reading one of the major concerns of the English department," and 21 per cent reported such discussion occurred "Occasionally, but not so frequently" as in the previous response. In Question 10, members of the sample were asked whether or not they believed teaching of reading should be done chiefly by specially trained teachers of reading in separate reading classes. Eighty-five per cent chose the reply, "Yes"; 13 per cent, "No"; and 2 per cent, "No opinion."

Therefore the basic conclusion appears to be, according to these replies that there was little cooperative faculty effort to teach reading and that teachers of junior high English prefer that reading instruction be given in separate classes rather than in the regular subject matter classrooms of the school. However, many reading authorities, as cited in Chapter I, have questioned the adequacy of separate classes for reading instruction to meet the needs of the students.

Although school-wide effort to teach reading was not found in most of the schools of the teachers who responded to this questionnaire, information elicited by other questions revealed that many of the English teachers in the sample were, in fact, providing some reading instruction for all students in their English classes. The remainder of this chapter discusses in detail the extent to which, in so doing, they followed certain practices of teaching reading.

Diagnosis of Students' Reading Abilities

Reading specialists have advised that the first step for the secondary instructor teaching an academic subject is to determine the reading ability of his pupils.[1] This would seem to be especially true of English teachers. Therefore, this section deals with diagnosing pupils' reading levels, and includes Questions 9 and 8. In Question 9, respondents were asked how they thought a diagnosis of students' reading levels and needs should be made prior to instruction. They were given a choice of three items, as follows: "by teacher-made tests," "by standard reading tests," and "with retarded readers but not necessarily with all students." A fourth choice was that "Diagnosis is probably unnecessary." Respondents could choose more than one item. Ninety-nine per cent indicated they believed diagnosis should be made by choosing one or more of the first three items. One per cent indicated they thought diagnosis should not be made, by choosing the fourth item. Of the 99 per cent who thought diagnosis should be made, 13 per cent chose as the instrument for diagnosis, teacher-made tests; 40 per cent, standard reading tests; and 31 per cent, both kinds of tests. Fifteen per cent chose the item "with retarded readers but not necessarily with all students." Of this 15 per cent, 7 per cent chose also one or more

---

[1] Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 78.

of the other items, as follows: 2 per cent, "by teacher-made tests," 4 per cent, "by standard reading tests," and 1 per cent, both kinds of tests. The other 8 per cent did not denote the kinds of tests to be used. Most reading specialists have agreed that teacher-made tests and teacher observation are the best methods for diagnosis; however, standardized test scores may be used to measure some aspects of reading if the teacher interprets them wisely.[1]

Question 8 is concerned with interpretation of standard test scores, and in it respondents were asked to choose the level they considered the scores on standardized reading tests to be reflective of. They were offered a choice of three items, as follows: (A) "the level beyond that on which the student should be taught," (B) "the level on which the student should be taught," and (C) "the level on which the student should read independently." A fourth item was (D) "unknown interpretation." Fifteen per cent chose the fourth response. Of the remaining 85 per cent, 15 per cent chose Item A; 25 per cent, Item B; and 45 per cent, Item C. Most authorities in the field have stated that reading levels revealed by standardized reading test scores are "frustration" levels of reading, that they are six months to a year beyond the student's instructional level (the level on which he reads with guidance and help from the teacher), and over a year beyond the level on which he can read

---

[1] Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 86.

independently.[1] Thus, the 70 per cent who checked Items B and C were not interpreting the standardized test scores correctly. Since 15 per cent indicated that they did not know how to intepret such scores, the implication is that 85 per cent of the respondents could not accurately use standard reading test scores to diagnose their students' reading levels,[2] although 70 per cent in Question 9 indicated that they thought standard reading tests should be used for diagnosis of pupils' reading levels.

Provisions for Helping Retarded Readers

All subject matter teachers have, according to reading authorities, the responsibility to help students in their classes who are reading below grade level and to provide them with materials for reading on their instructional reading levels.[3] Bearing in mind that English is an important subject matter taught in the secondary school, Questions 6, 7, and 11 are related to provisions which the respondents of the study made to meet these obligations. Studies and surveys have revealed that the spread in reading levels in the average secondary classroom is six to nine grades.[4] Therefore, it is not surprising

---

[1]Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 87.

[2]Diederich, "About Evaluation," pp. 853-68. In this article is a detailed discussion of standardized reading test interpretation.

[3]Marsheffel, Better Reading, p. 119.

[4]Ibid., p. 47.

to find, in response to Question 6, that all teachers replying reported that they had retarded readers in their classes. Asked to approximate the per cent of the class membership they considered to be retarded, the ninety-two respondents replied as follows: thirty-seven teachers estimated the amount to be 10 per cent; twenty teachers, 25 per cent; twenty-five teachers, 50 per cent; eight teachers, 75 per cent; and two teachers, 100 per cent.[1] Of course, "retarded readers" was not defined, and this is an imperfect estimate at best, but it is sufficient to indicate the respondents had "problem" readers in their classes whose needs should be met.

In Question 7, respondents were asked how often they supplied their retarded readers with reading materials on their instructional reading level. Thirty-two per cent replied that they did so "Regularly"; 43 per cent, "Occasionally"; 13 per cent "Rarely"; and 12 per cent, "Never." Since, according to the previous section, few of the respondents knew how to diagnose their students' instructional levels correctly on the basis of standardized tests, this question gives no indication of the success of their efforts, and only discloses how often they tried to supply them with reading materials on their own levels. Only one third reported they did so "Regularly."

Most reading experts have agreed that students should be grouped in some manner for reading, according to their reading abilities,

---

[1]These figures are given in terms of numbers of teachers replying rather than percentages to avoid confusing percentages of respondents with percentages of retarded readers in the classes.

in the secondary as well as elementary English classes, in order to provide guidance for students who are reading different materials simultaneously, and to give help with background and vocabulary for the materials being read. In most secondary anthologies, some help is supplied in the form of introductory paragraphs, and vocabulary lists and questions following the selections, but many students fail to use these helps.[1] To discover whether or not the respondents in this study grouped their students for reading, in Question 11, they were asked for information about grouping practices in their classes. In order to avoid prejudicing the replies, respondents were asked to indicate any of the following purposes for which they grouped students in their classes: (A) "Vocabulary development," (B) "Language skills development," (C) "Reading," (D) "Discussion"; a fifth choice, (E) "Class handled as a unit," was also offered. Eleven per cent checked only Item C, "Reading"; 30 per cent checked Item C and one or more of the other items. None checked Item A, "Vocabulary development," 2 per cent checked only Item B, "Language skills development," 4 per cent checked only Item D, "Discussion," 31 per cent checked only Item E, "Class handled as a unit," and 7 per cent checked only Item E and Item D, "Discussion." The other 15 per cent checked various combinations of items, not including Item C, "Reading." Therefore, the implication of these findings is that although all teachers reported

---

[1]Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 217.

that they had retarded readers, and 75 per cent that they supplied such students with reading materials on their levels at least occasionally, only 41 per cent were providing group guidance in reading to help meet the needs of these learners, as well as of the average and above-average readers in their classrooms.

Development of Vocabulary

Two phases of vocabulary development are explored in this section: vocabulary expansion and word attack skills development. Questions 12, 14, 15, and 13 concern vocabulary expansion. It is in this learning task that instruction in English and reading may be said to overlap, for this is an aspect of both disciplines. In Question 12, teachers were asked whether or not they considered vocabulary development within their English classes to be (A) "an important and integral part of their program to be taught deliberately and systematically," or (B) "only one facet of their program and necessarily taught only to a limited extent." Sixty-six per cent checked Item A, "taught deliberately and systematically," 34 per cent checked Item B, "taught only to a limited extent." Most educators have echoed Fey's statement that "it would be difficult to overemphasize the importance of vocabulary development" in the secondary school.[1] Hence, according to these choices, only two thirds of the respondents to this study

---

[1] Leo C. Fey, Reading in the High School. What Research Says to the Teacher, Number 11. (Washington, D. C.: Department of Classroom Teachers, American Educational Research Association of the National Education Association, 1956), p. 16.

emphasized vocabulary development to the extent that educators have deemed desirable.

In Questions 14 and 15, methods used to foster vocabulary development are explored. Respondents were asked, in Question 14 (if a part of their program was promoting vocabulary growth) to indicate in order of importance which of the following they considered most profitable, (A) "use of dictionary definitions and word lists," (B) "study of word usage within the context of reading selections," or (C) "study of affixes, roots, etc." Seventy-four per cent placed Item A, "context," as their first choice; 12 per cent chose first, Item C, "study of word parts"; 10 per cent, Item A, "use of dictionary." Three per cent chose a fourth response (D) "Does not apply," indicating they used none of these methods as part of their programs; 1 per cent did not place their choices in rank order, only checked them. Although there are dangers inherent in relying too much on the use of context to unlock word meanings,[1] this is one of the most powerful aids students can learn to enable them to increase their vocabularies, and, with guidance, is a most valuable method for promoting vocabulary development among students. Additionally, although the use of a dictionary is an essential element in learning the meanings of words, it should be combined with the use of context clues;[2] half of

---

[1] Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 240.

[2] Ibid., p. 249.

the teachers who placed dictionary usage as their first choice denoted context as their second choice. These responses indicate that 80 per cent of the respondents stated they were emphasizing the most highly recommended methods of fostering vocabulary expansion, because 74 per cent elected context as their first choice and 6 per cent of those who elected dictionary usage as their first choice elected context as their second choice.

Question 15 is concerned with the most profitable time for word study when reading an assigned selection. Choices offered the respondents were the following: (A) "when a student has completed reading," (B) "prior to reading," or (C) "when a student comes to an unfamiliar word in his reading." They could choose more than one. Ninety-four per cent chose either Item B or Item C, or both, to wit: 45 per cent, Item B, "prior to reading"; 42 per cent Item C, "during reading"; and 7 per cent, both. Two per cent chose Items A, B, and C; 4 per cent chose Item A, "when a student has completed reading." Therefore, almost all of the teachers in this sample reported that they employed the most highly recommended times for the study of words in reading a selection, since the best times for such study are usually recognized to be either prior to reading, or when a student comes to an unfamiliar word in his reading.[1]

---

[1]Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 34. Here the author described the need for introducing new vocabulary before reading a selection.

The other phase of vocabulary development, instruction in word attack skills, is covered briefly in Question 13. Most secondary teachers expect their students to have trouble with multi-syllabic words, and in their language curriculum spend considerable time on prefixes, suffixes, and root words,[1] but many do not realize that a sizeable number of students who have difficulty getting the meanings of words also have poor word recognition skills.[2] Marksheffel said, "Good readers who have minor problems in word recognition and corrective readers who are word-recognition cases may improve their reading efficiency when they receive adequate instruction in word-attack skills."[3] In Question 13, respondents were asked to what extent they spent any class time reviewing and developing word recognition aids, such as phonics, structural analysis, syllabication, etc., as a basis for vocabulary development. Twenty-four per cent chose the response, "Regularly"; 52 per cent, "Occasionally"; 21 per cent, "Rarely"; and 3 per cent, "Never." Since incidental or occasional teaching of word attack skills is of questionable value, as pointed out in Chapter 1, only 24 per cent of the respondents reported that they

---

[1]Most junior high language texts and curriculum guides include exercises and drills on these aspects of vocabulary development. In the previous question, 12 per cent chose this as their first choice, as a method of building vocabulary.

[2]Fey, Reading in the High School, p. 17.

[3]Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 195.

were using practices designed to meet the needs of the students who were deficient in these aspects of the reading act.

Materials for Reading

This section deals with teachers' choices of materials for their students to read and includes Questions 22, 21, 23, and 25. For reasons described previously, a wide variety of reading materials is desirable for assigned reading and for independent reading in the secondary English classroom. In Question 22, teachers were asked to what extent they designed their own programs, implying they were free to choose materials for reading. Forty-six per cent marked the response, "To a great extent"; 35 per cent, "To considerable extent"; 18 per cent, "To fair extent only"; 1 per cent, "To little or no extent." Since so large a number designed their own programs it is important to know methods used for selecting these materials. In Question 21, respondents were asked to rate in order of importance the following as bases for the selection of classroom reading selections: (A) "Interest inventory of the students," (B) "Interests of teacher," (C) "Material in anthologies," and (D) "Curriculum guides." Only 2 per cent rated first "Interests of teacher"; 58 per cent, "Interest inventory of students"; 26 per cent, "Material in anthologies"; and 14 per cent, "Curriculum guides." Authorities in the field of reading have suggested that interests of students should play a major part

in the choice of selections for reading.[1] Although, through skillful preparation, a teacher may arouse interest in a piece of literature he feels he should teach, student interests offer clues for selecting reading assignments which should be approached with enthusiasm by the students.

In Question 23, respondents were asked if they used any texts or other materials specifically designed for the development of reading skills, not including literature texts. Twenty-three per cent replied that they "Never" used such materials; 20 per cent, "Rarely"; 40 per cent, "Occasionally"; 15 per cent "Regularly"; and 2 per cent checked the item, "Does not apply," implying that such materials had no place in their programs. McGuire stated that even though there is little agreement concerning the extent to which such materials should be used in the regular English class, they have a place in the high school reading program.[2] In the English Journal, official publication for secondary teachers of the National Council of Teachers of English, Devine described a number of remedial teaching materials which he recommended for use in the English classes.[3] Therefore,

---

[1]Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 72.

[2]McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, p. 33.

[3]Thomas G. Devine, "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Materials for Teaching Reading?" English Journal, LVIII (September, 1969), 847-52.

the fact that 55 per cent of the teachers who replied to this question stated that they used materials specifically designed for the development of reading skills, at least occasionally, would seem to subscribe to the premise that such materials have a place in their English classes.

In Question 25, respondents were asked if they used paper-back books as part of their reading program (e.g. keeping classroom library of paper-backs, distributing lists of good paper-backs, etc.) In reply, 43 per cent reported that they did so "Regularly"; 32 per cent, "Occasionally"; 8 per cent, "Rarely"; and 17 per cent "Never." The value of such books in increasing students' interest in and love of reading was illustrated by Fader in his widely read publication, Hooked on Books,[1] and their use has been frequently encouraged in the English Journal and other professional publications. These findings with regard to the use of paper-backs indicate that over half of those replying have failed to recognize the potential worth of paper-backs in the English program.[2] The implication of the foregoing replies in this section is that, though almost all respondents were free to choose

---

[1] Donald N. Fader and Elton B. McNeil, Hooked on Books: Program & Proof (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968).

[2] Since this question is similar to one used in the McGuire study, it is interesting to note that the percentage of users in this study is considerably lower than the percentage of users given in that study as revealed in The Teaching of Reading, p. 32. The difference might be explained by the fact that all respondents of the McGuire study were members of the National Council of Teachers of English and might be influenced in their teaching practices by the English Journal.

the materials to be read by their students, only half were making their choices in accordance with recommended criteria.

Promotion of Interest and Taste in Reading

As stated in the opening paragraph of Chapter I, it is in the development of interest and taste in reading that the English teacher has his greatest challenge and, at the same time, his greatest opportunity. A major aim of all reading instruction is said to be the creation of the desire to read, for it is only in the act of reading that improvement in the aspects of vocabulary and comprehension skills can come.[1] Shaw composed the following round:

> The more you read, the more you learn;
> The more you learn, the more you understand what you read;
> The more you understand what you read, the more you like to read;
> The more you like to read, the more you read.[2]

Many agree that this is true. Students must be motivated to read if they are to increase their interest and taste in reading, and such motivation may be successfully fostered in two ways, through preparation for assigned reading, (or guidance), and through recreational reading in which the students read books of their own choices. This section concerns both types of reading. Questions 16, 17, and 18 are designed to probe the extent to which teachers used the assignment

---

[1] Marksheffel, Better Reading, pp. 62-76.

[2] Philip Shaw, Effective Learning and Language (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1955), quoted by Karlin in Teaching Reading in High School, p. 227.

period "to capture students' interest and motivate students' learning," as Marksheffel recommended.[1] In Question 18, respondents were asked how often their preparation of students for reading a selection included "discussion of background study"; in Question 17, how often their preparation of students for reading a selection included "setting up a purpose for the reading"; in Question 16, how often their preparation of students for reading expository material included "questions to be answered". All three factors are a part of getting the student set to read.[2] The responses to these questions are presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

TABLE 1.--Frequency with which three factors were included in preparing students to read assigned selections

Question	Factors	Percentage of responses				
		Never	Rarely	Occa-sion-ally	Regu-lar-ly	Does not Apply
17	Discussion of background	0	2	36	62	0
16	Purpose for reading	0	2	20	78	0
15	Questions to be answered in expository material	1	12	46	38	3

As indicated in the table, a large portion of the teachers in the sample were using the first two factors of the assignment period to

[1] Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 32.

[2] Ibid., p. 38.

increase interest in the material to be read. The lowest percentage, 38 per cent, who regularly gave students questions to answer before the reading, may be low because junior high students may not read expository material regularly. The highest percentage, 78 per cent, who regularly set up a purpose for reading, were using what is considered to be a valuable adjunct of the learning process, working toward clear-cut objectives. Sixty-two per cent regularly discussed backgrounds for materials to be read. Thus, at least two of these three prescribed methods of teaching reading were being utilized, according to their reports, by a large number of the respondents.

It is in a recreational, or personal, reading program that the teacher has the greatest opportunity to foster student interest and taste in reading. In order to develop into adults who not only can, but will read, students need class time to read materials they have selected for themselves.[1] In Question 26, respondents were asked, "Do you have a regular period for individualized recreational reading in your classes at the present time?" They could choose one of three items, as follows: "In all classes," "In some classes," or "In no classes." Sixty per cent (fifty-five teachers) chose the item, "In all classes"; 23 per cent (twenty-one teachers) chose the item, "In some

---

[1]Robert Farrar Kinder, "Encouraging Personal Reading in Junior High School," International Reading Association. Proceedings of Eleventh Annual Convention, Vistas in Reading, XI, Part I (Newark, 1967), 417-19. (Hereinafter referred to as "Encouraging Personal Reading.")

classes"; 15 per cent (fourteen teachers) chose the item, "In no classes"; and 2 per cent (two teachers) chose none of these items. Therefore, 83 per cent (seventy-six respondents) indicated that they had recreational reading programs and answered Questions 27 through 31 with regard to these programs.

Answers to these five questions revealed the use that was made of this personal reading period and was, of course, answered by these seventy-six respondents. In answer to Question 27, "Do your students keep reading records of books read in this period and outside of school?" 70 per cent chose the response, "Yes," 30 per cent, "No." That students should keep some kind of reading records of their personal reading has been recommended in literature published by the National Council of Teachers of English and by many reading authorities,[1] but, of course, the answers to this question did not disclose the utilization of such records. Used to determine students' interests as a basis for the selection of class instructional materials, and made available to other students as an opportunity for the sharing of reading experiences, they may be very valuable.[2]

The next two questions are related to book reports. In Question 28, respondents were asked if their students gave periodic book reports on books read in this free reading period. In response,

---

[1]Mary Clifford, "Reading in the Junior High School," in Reading in the Secondary Schools, ed. by M. Jerry Weiss (New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961), p. 433.

[2]Ibid.

78 per cent answered "Yes," 22 per cent, "No." As to the kinds of reports, in Question 29, respondents were asked to indicate which of the following methods of reporting they used most frequently (they could choose more than one): (A) "Formal written"; (B) "Informal written"; (C) "Formal oral"; (D) "Informal oral"; (E) "Personal reports to teacher"; (E) "Other." Since some of the respondents chose more than one reply, results of this question are given in terms of number of choices instead of percentage of replies. Each of the items was chosen the following number of times; (A) "Formal written," twenty-two times; (B) "Informal written," twenty-seven times; (C) "Formal oral," fourteen times; (D) "Informal oral," twenty-two times; (E) "Personal reports to teacher," six times; and (F) "Other," thirteen times. Total choices numbered one hundred four, and of these, only six were "Personal reports to teacher." In Question 30, when respondents were asked how often they discussed "individually with their students the books they read," 13 per cent replied, "Regularly"; 63 per cent, "Occasionally"; 18 per cent, "Rarely"; and 6 per cent, "Never." Since only six choices were made of the item, "Personal reports to teacher," in the preceding question (8 per cent of those replying to that question), the implication is that a portion of the 13 per cent who indicated they regularly discussed "individually with their students the books they read" must have considered this some other type of book report, or not a book report at all. Authorities in the

field of reading have stated that enthusiasm for reading is generated in recreational reading programs when teachers read the students' books and discuss them with their students, and when students share their reading experiences with each other informally.[1] Karlin quoted Lacy as saying, with reference to classroom practices, such as formal book reports, which make children dislike reading, that the "elementary school teaches children to read; the secondary school teaches children not to read."[2] Results of these two questions indicate that the teachers replying were, too often, failing to encourage reading in their recreational reading programs, and were sometimes discouraging it.

In Question 31, respondents were asked with what frequency they promoted recreational reading program by use of posters, book exhibits, student evaluation cards, etc. Responses were as follows: 32 per cent chose the reply, "Regularly," 39 per cent, "Occasionally," 21 per cent, "Rarely," and 8 per cent, "Never." Travelling book exhibits and librarians in the public schools have often demonstrated the value of attractive displays of books. Reading experts have advocated similar arrangements in reading and English classes in the secondary school.[3]

---

[1]Kinder, "Encouraging Personal Reading," p. 418.

[2]Karlin, Teaching Reading in High School, p. 210.

[3]Kinder, "Encouraging Personal Reading," p. 419.

Replies to the foregoing questions reveal some of the practices which teachers who participated in this study were using to promote reading in their recreational reading programs. The implication of the findings is that the potential value of such a program was not being fully realized in many cases.

Instruction for Reading Non-literary Materials

This section concerns practices of teaching which help students acquire the skills necessary to read specialized textbooks and research materials used in the various subjects taught in the secondary school. Some of these higher levels of reading skills were delineated in Chapter I. Seven questions are related to these practices, Questions 32 through 38. An important skill taught in elementary grades which needs to be reenforced in the secondary grades is use of the library. Therefore, in Question 32, respondents were asked whether or not specific instruction in the use of the library was included in the first year English program of their schools. Answers revealed that such instruction was given in the schools of 92 per cent of the respondents who answered the question, "Yes." Six per cent answered, "No," and 2 per cent answered, "Do not know." The extent of the instruction or the use of it was, of course, not disclosed. However, it would seem that in almost all of the junior high schools canvassed, library use was taught to all students.[1]

[1]This figure is almost identical to the percentage of affirmative replies given to a similar question in McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, p. 33.

The remaining questions in this section are designed to determine the extent to which the respondents were teaching the skills needed to read informational types of materials. They were asked if they had taught certain units in which these kinds of writings were studied. In these questions, respondents were instructed to denote whether or not they had taught such units one or more times in the last two years. In Question 33, the unit[1] identified was one on the "reading of newspapers and/or periodicals"; Question 34, "propaganda analysis and/or study of advertising"; Question 25, "critical reading of non-fiction prose (other than the units mentioned in the two previous questions)"; Question 36, "a method of study for the purpose of study, such as the Survey Q3R method"; Question 37, "semantics"; Question 38, "study skills". In Table 2 are presented the percentages of teachers' responses to each question.

Reading experts have declared that specific instruction in reading the foregoing types of materials is an important need for students in the secondary school today. One of them, McGuire, stated that in the face of present "mass media" and "ideological conflict" skills in the reading of newspapers and periodicals, advertisements, and non-fiction prose cannot be over-emphasized.[2] In only one type of unit, study skills, was the "Yes" response over 50 per cent in this

---

[1]In Question 33, the parenthetical phrase (or some such group of learning activities) followed the word "unit."

[2]McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, p. 28.

TABLE 2*

TABLE 2. --Extent to which various reading units were taught

Question	Units	Percentage of responses	
		Yes	No
33	Reading of newspapers and/or periodicals	46	54
34	Propaganda analysis and/or study of advertisements	30	70
35	Critical reading of non-fiction prose	33	67
36	Study-type reading	37	63
37	Semantics	32	68
38	Study skills	67	33

*This table and Table 3 are similar to the tables in McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, pp. 28 and 30.

current study of the practices of Tulsa teachers. The value of such a unit, however, is problematical (as pointed out in Chapter I) unless the skills are reinforced by guided practice in the other subject matter courses. On the whole, the prevalence of low "yes" responses in this group of questions indicates that these areas of reading instruction were being neglected in too many of the classes of the respondents.

Instruction for Reading of Literature

This section concerns that generally accepted aspect of the language arts program, the teaching of literature, but more specifically,

the teaching of reading skills in the context of teaching literature, a differentiation pointed out in Chapter I. In Question 39, respondents were asked to choose which of four statements most nearly described the types of materials they used in teaching reading skills. Responses were given as follows: 50 per cent chose the response, "It is almost wholly in the teaching of literature that I teach such skills"; 27 per cent, "I teach reading skills chiefly in my teaching of literature, but to some extent I teach them also through units on critical reading of non-fiction prose, etc."; 14 per cent, "In teaching reading skills I use the non-literature components (i.e. such units as those previously mentioned) and the literature components about evenly"; 8 per cent, "In teaching reading skills I use the non-literature components somewhat more than the literature components." One per cent chose the reply, "Does not apply," denoting by this response that they used none of these types of materials in teaching reading skills. Since many English teachers have said they "teach reading every day," as reported in Chapter I, it is not surprising that 77 per cent denoted by their responses that they taught reading skills chiefly in their teaching of literature, since this is generally accepted as a major component of the discipline, English. In the remaining questions an attempt was made to ascertain whether or not teachers differentiated between the teaching of literature and the teaching of how to read literature, as delineated in Chapter I. In ten questions, 40 through 49, respondents were asked to indicate to what extent, in their teaching of literature,

they deliberately and systematically attempted to develop certain abilities and/or understandings. Results of these questions appear in Table 3.

TABLE 3

TABLE 3.--Extent to which teachers emphasized various skills in context of literature

Question	Reading Ability and/or Understanding Pertaining to:	Percentage of responses			
		Great Extent	Considerable Extent	Fair Extent Only	Little or No Extent
40	Determining author's purpose in work as a whole	27	42	28	3
41	Distinguishing narrator (voice) from author	14	36	36	14
42	Detecting theme	38	51	10	1
45	Recognizing tone	12	45	33	10
43	Distinguishing denotation and connotation of words in context	20	38	33	9
44	Understanding figurative language	21	50	24	5
47	Understanding syntax in poetry	10	24	44	22
48	Sensitivity to sound of poetry	19	31	31	19
46	Participating vicariously in experiences of character in literary work	42	39	18	1
49	Recognizing human values implicit in behaviors of story characters	59	35	5	1

The percentage of those who chose the response "to a great extent" may be combined with the percentage of those who chose the response "to a considerable extent" to determine the percentage who reported that they taught in these ways to considerable extent or more. Results reveal that in three of the questions a bare majority or less taught these skills. The lowest percentage was in response to Question 34 -- 34 per cent who said they attempted to develop in their students understanding of syntax of poetry to this extent, whereas 50 per cent emphasized the sound of poetry and 50 per cent, the distinguishing of narrator (voice) from author. It seems probable that the study of syntax might be more profitably developed in the higher grades of the secondary schools. Of the other aspects of reading covered in this portion of the questionnaire, using the same criteria, the three highest were as follows: Question 49, recognizing human values (94 per cent), detecting theme (89 per cent), and participating vicariously in experiences of characters in stories read (81 per cent). The first might reflect the impact of the current interest in the teaching of the humanities, while the next highest, detecting theme, might indicate a moralistic approach to literature;[1] the third highest, vicarious participation, might reveal a desire on the part of the teachers to help their students enjoy the literature read.

It seems regrettable that all of these abilities and/or understandings were not more thoroughly taught by the respondents to this

[1]McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, p. 29.

study.[1] Many suggestions for developing such skills are abundantly available to English teachers in their professional journals and teacher's manuals for literature anthologies.

Development of Other Aspects -- Creative Application of Reading, Oral Reading, and Speed Skills

This section reveals information about three other aspects of reading -- creative use of reading, oral reading, and speed reading skills. In Question 19, respondents were asked how often they used selections read in class as a basis for assignments in creative activities (writing, drama, etc.). Ninety-nine per cent indicated that they followed this practice, 51 per cent choosing the response, "Occasionally" and 48 per cent, "Regularly." One per cent chose the response, "Rarely"; none chose the response, "Never." Most anthologies contain suggestions for enrichment activities growing out of the reading of selections in the collections. Participation in such activities may bring increased interest and enthusiasm to the task of reading and may offer opportunities for successful performances by all readers, good and poor alike.

Question 20 concerned the frequency with which all students

---

[1] Except for two items, "Detecting theme," and "Participating vicariously in experiences of literary work," the percentages teaching these aspects of reading were considerably lower than those responding to similar questions on the McGuire study. The percentage teaching "Understanding syntax in poetry" is approximately half that in the McGuire study as described in The Teaching of Reading, pp. 29-30.

read orally in class. Respondents were asked to choose from five possible items, as follows: "Never," "Rarely," "Occasionally," "Regularly," and "Only the good readers." One per cent chose the item, "Never"; 9 per cent, "Rarely"; 63 per cent, "Occasionally"; 24 per cent, "Regularly," and 3 per cent, "Only the good readers." It seems that most of the teachers replying were making some use of this method to increase skill in reading, although only one fourth were doing so regularly. The value of oral reading, until the 40's the principal method of instruction in reading, fell into disrepute for a number of years, as silent reading became popular because it brought increase in speed of reading. However, of late this practice, reading aloud, has been encouraged by many English teachers.[1] Oral reading has been said by many to be a valuable aid in improving a student's overall reading skill, and the use of a tape recorder and choral reading, excellent devices to increase interest in the reading act.[2]

Another controversial aspect of reading instruction is whether or not teachers should stress increase in speed of reading. Answers

---

[1] K-12 Language Arts Steering Committee, Oral Reading, Tulsa, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

[2] In a workshop for reading teachers, 1971, Margherite La Pota, present supervisor of the English Department of the Tulsa Public Schools, demonstrated choral reading of a Bible passage as a means of improving reading skills in an English or reading class.

to Question 24 revealed that only 2 per cent of the respondents "used materials and devices to increase their students' speed in reading" "To great extent"; 13 per cent, "To considerable extent"; 33 per cent, "To fair extent only"; and 52 per cent, "To little or no extent." McGuire suggested the possibility that such skills might best be developed in special classes or laboratories, but at the same time he raised the question as to whether or not those students who "need or wish to learn to read more rapidly" are given opportunity to satisfy their need.[1] Certainly, development of a flexible reading rate is one major skill needed in secondary and higher education and should be deliberately taught.[2] The inference from the responses to this question might be that insufficient attention is given to rate of reading in the English classrooms of the respondents.

Summary

A wide spectrum of practices of teaching reading has been presented in this chapter. No attempt has been made to ascertain the success of these practices or the accuracy of these reports. But, from the foregoing detailed analysis, several conclusions may be drawn, which is the subject of the subsequent and final chapter of this report.

---

[1] McGuire, The Teaching of Reading, p. 31.

[2] Strang and Bracken, Making Better Readers, pp. 117-120.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study surveyed the practices in teaching reading of the English teachers in junior high schools of the Tulsa Public Schools. The following conclusions may be made from the results.

Most of the teachers replying appeared to be teaching reading to some extent and were following generally prescribed methods for so doing. Almost all agreed that students' reading levels should be diagnosed prior to instruction, and more than 80 per cent favored using standard and/or teacher-made tests. Eighty per cent fostered vocabulary growth through the study of words in context previous to, or during, the reading of a selection. Approximately 80 per cent utilized the assignment period to set up a purpose for reading a selection; more than 60 per cent, to provide background information. More than 80 per cent included a recreational reading program in their curriculums, and the students of 70 per cent of these kept reading records. In the schools of more than 90 per cent of the respondents, instruction in the use of the library was given in the seventh grade. Approximately 70 per cent taught units on study skills. More than 75 per cent reported that they taught reading skills chiefly

in their teaching of literature. Most taught some of the critical skills necessary for this reading, as follows: more than 80 per cent were helping students develop ability to determine theme in literary works, to experience vicariously feelings of characters in stories read, and to recognize the human values implicit in the behavior of story characters; more than 70 per cent were helping students to determine an author's purpose and to understand figurative language; more than 95 per cent were promoting creative activities based on selections read. These learnings are related to narrative rather than to informational types of writing.

Certain other aspects of the teaching of reading were not being taught by 70 per cent, or more, of the respondents to this study. Eighty-five per cent failed to interpret scores on standard reading tests correctly. Although all teachers had retarded readers in their classes, slightly more than 30 per cent were regularly supplying them with reading materials on their levels, and approximately 40 per cent were grouping their students for reading. Less than 70 per cent were deliberately and systematically fostering vocabulary development in their classes, and less than 25 per cent were regularly reviewing and developing word recognition skills. Although slightly more than 80 per cent designed their own programs to considerable extent at least, less than 60 per cent based their choices on interests of students, and 55 per cent used materials designed to develop reading skills occasionally or

regularly; less than 45 per cent regularly utilized paper-back books in their classrooms. In their recreational reading programs, the large majority required book reports of some kind, and less than 15 per cent regularly discussed with students the books they read; less than 35 per cent used habitually promotional aides, such as book exhibits, to promote interest and enthusiasm for reading. Less than 40 per cent gave their students questions to be answered prior to reading expository materials. Less than 50 per cent taught units on news media, critical reading of non-fiction prose, study type reading, and semantics. Such units develop reading skills necessary for content materials found in textbooks of academic courses in secondary school and in much of adult reading. In the critical skills necessary for the reading of literature, less than 70 per cent of the respondents were helping their students to develop the ability to distinguish the author's voice, to identify denotation and connotation of words in context, to recognize tone, and to understand syntax of poetry and respond to its sounds. Less than 25 per cent regularly provided opportunities for their students to read orally, and less than 15 per cent sought to increase their students' speed in reading.

Thus, in the main, the systematic and deliberate teaching of reading desired by reading authorities was not being given in the classes of most of the respondents to this questionnaire. Most failed to see reading in the broad communication sense needed to provide necessary growth in all reading skills among their students.

Although 85 per cent of the teachers responding disclaimed responsibility for teaching reading when they specified that they believed this task should be accomplished chiefly by reading teachers, most teachers in the sample seemed to be interested in the subject. This may be inferred by the rapidity with which the questionnaires were returned and the high percentage of return. Within a period of thirty days after the questionnaires were mailed, 82 per cent were returned. The instrument was quite lengthy, comprising seven pages, the forms of response were quite varied so that responding required close reading, yet all of the forty-nine questions were answered by eighty-four of the ninety-two respondents; omissions by the remainder were infrequent. Although no provisions were made for comments, many respondents wrote in observations and explanations for their answers, which, though interesting, were not included in the analysis of results.

Additionally, these teachers reported that they were receiving little help in the teaching of reading through school-wide or departmental meetings for regular consultations on the subject.

Therefore, it is recommended that in-service training be provided to the English teachers in the Tulsa junior high schools to enable them to more effectively include reading instruction in their classes. Fifteen of the nineteen junior high schools in Tulsa have reading programs. In one school the program is entirely incorporated into the English classes. In the others, except for the school which has

a developmental program in a reading department, special reading classes have been organized within the English departments. Marksheffel wrote that this kind of reading program is the least efficient of any because only a few students can be helped by a reading teacher in special classes. He suggested that reading specialists help the English and other subject matter teachers teach reading within their course content, so all students could benefit.[1]

Although the needs of the retarded readers must be met, reading specialists in these schools might use a portion of their time to provide in-service training for English teachers. Utilization of films available for such training, and other audio-visual materials in the teachers' own buildings during their planning periods, together with demonstration lessons in the teachers' classes, might provide the necessary training without adding too much to the teachers' heavy assignments. Though this would not provide for the developmental reading program recommended by reading authorities, it would be a beginning. Silberman suggested that schools today should provide "short-run reform," while preparing for the "longer-run concern,"[2] in this case, a developmental reading program. This could be accomplished in the junior high schools of Tulsa utilizing the personnel and materials presently available.

---

[1]Marksheffel, Better Reading, p. 118.

[2]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books and Reports

Bamman, Henry A.; Hogan, Ursula; and Greene, Charles E. Reading Instruction in the Secondary Schools. New York: Longmans Green and Company, 1961.

Conant, James R. The American High School Today. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

ERIC. Trends and Practices in Secondary School Reading, 036-669. Microfiche.

Fader, Donald N. and McNeil, Elton B. Hooked on Books: Program & Proof. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1968.

Fey, Leo C. Reading in the High School. What Research Says to the Teacher, Number 11. Washington, D. C.: Department of Classroom Teachers, American Educational Research Association of the National Education Association, 1956.

Karlin, Robert. Teaching Reading in High School. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1964.

McGuire, George K. The Teaching of Reading by English Teachers in Public High Schools: A National Survey. Washington D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1969.

Marksheffel, Ned. D. Better Reading in the Secondary School. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1966.

National Association of Secondary-School Principals. The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, Improving Reading Instruction in the Secondary School, XXXIV. February, 1950.

National Education Association, Research Bulletin, Reading Instruction in Secondary Schools, XX. January, 1942.

National Society for the Study of Education. Development In and Through Reading, 1961. Sixtieth Yearbook of the Society, Part 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

_____. Reading in the High School and College, 1948. Forty-seventh Yearbook of the Society, Part II. Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1948.

_____. Report of the National Committee on Reading, 1925. Twenty-fourth Yearbook of the Society, Part I. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Company, 1925.

_____. The Teaching of Reading: A Second Report, 1937. Thirty-sixth Yearbook of the Society, Part I. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Company, 1937.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Simpson, Elizabeth A. Helping High-School Students Read Better. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1954.

Squire, James R., and Applebee, Roger K. High School English Instruction Today. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts., 1968.

Stauffer, Russell G. Teaching Reading as a Thinking Process. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.

Strang, Ruth, and Bracken, Dorothy Kendall. Making Better Readers. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1957.

_____; McCullough, Constance M.; Traxler, Arther E. Problems in the Improvement of Reading. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

Tulsa Public Schools. Profiles of Achievement in Tulsa Public Schools. Tulsa, Oklahoma: Tulsa Public Schools, 1970.

Articles in Books, Reports, and Encyclopedias

Andresen, Oliver. "Instructional Procedures in Reading in Grades Nine Through Fourteen." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-ninth Annual Conference, Reading: Seventy-five Years of Progress, XXVIII. Chicago, 1966. 63-68.

Artley, A. Sterl. "The Development of Reading Maturity in High School -- Implications of the Gray-Rogers Study." Improving Reading in Secondary Schools. Edited by Lawrence E. Hafner. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967. pp. 13-19.

_____. "Educating Teachers for Secondary Reading Instruction." International Reading Association. Proceedings of the Annual Convention, Improvement of Reading through Classroom Practices, IX. Newark, 1964. 19-20.

_____. "Influence of Specific Factors on Growth in Interpretation." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-ninth Annual Conference, Reading: Seventy-five Years of Progress, XXVIII. Chicago, 1966. 71-81.

Barnette, Gaspar Cisneros. "Reading in the Space Age." Tachisto-films Manual. Sunland, Calif.: Learning Through Seeing, Inc., Sixth Printing. pp. 11-12.

Bell, John W. "Patterns of Basic Instruction in Reading -- Their Advantages and Limitations in Junior and Senior High School." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Eleventh Annual Conference, Basic Instruction in Reading in Elementary and High Schools, X. Chicago, 1948. 32-37.

Betts, Emmett A. "Reading is Thinking." Improving Reading in Secondary Schools. Edited by Lawrence E. Hafner. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967. pp. 46-52.

Bivins, Betty M. "How to Read a Victorian Novel," Improving Reading in Secondary Schools. Edited by Lawrence E. Hafner. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967. pp. 362-67.

Cleland, Donald L. "Needed Improvement in Research Design in Reading." International Reading Association. Proceedings of the Annual Convention, Improvement of Reading through Classroom Practices, IX. Newark, 1964. 244-47.

Clifford, Mary. "Reading in the Junior High School." Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961. pp. 428-35.

Corbin, Richard. "Semantics in the Secondary School." Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961. pp. 219-26.

Courtney, Leonard, Brother. "Recent Developments in Reading Instruction in the Content Areas." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 134-44.

Covert, Marshall. "Enlisting Faculty-Wide Cooperation for Improvement of Reading Skills in Senior High School." Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961. pp. 31-35.

Crosby, Muriel. "Interrelationships of Reading and the Other Language Arts." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-sixth Annual Conference, Reading and the Language Arts, XXV. Chicago, 1963. 23-31.

Davis, Stanley E. "High School and College Instructors Can't Teach Reading? Nonsense!" Teaching Reading: Selected Materials. Edited by Walter B. Barbe. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965. pp. 304-310.

Dilly, Lois Anne. "Types of Development in Reading Needed in Content Fields in Secondary Schools in Literature." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Eighth Annual Conference, Improving Reading in Content Fields, VIII. Chicago, 1946. 51-55.

Early, Margaret J. "About Successful Reading Programs." Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1961. pp. 415-27.

Gans, Roma. "Greater Reading Power Needed Today." Readings on Reading Instruction. Edited by Albert J. Harris. New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 1963. pp. 21-25.

Gray, William S. "Current Reading Problems: A World View." Readings on Reading Instruction. Edited by Albert J. Harris. New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 1963. pp. 1-5.

_____. "Nature and Scope of a Sound Reading Program." National Society for the Study of Education. Reading in the High School and College, 1948. Forty-seventh Yearbook of the Society. Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948. 46-67.

_____. "Progress Achieved and the Tasks Faced in Improving Reading in Various Curriculum Areas." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Fifteenth Annual Conference, Improving Reading in All Curriculum Areas, XIV, Chicago, 1952. 6-11.

_____. "Reading." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 3rd ed., 1960, pp. 1086-1135.

Hafner, Lawrence E. "Preface." Improving Reading in Secondary Schools. Edited by Lawrence E. Hafner. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967. pp. vii-viii.

_____. "The Uses of Reading and the Need for Reading Instruction." Improving Reading in Secondary Schools. Edited by Lawrence E. Hafner. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967. pp. 2-13.

Harris, Albert J. "Reading." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 4th ed., 1969. pp. 1069-1104.

Hess, Daniel K. "Using New Instructional Materials." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 44-47.

Hjermstad, Fritz. "Identifying Significant Reading Skills in Grades Nine through Fourteen." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-ninth Annual Conference, Reading: Seventy-five Years of Progress, XXVIII. Chicago, 1966. 41-43.

Huelsman, Charles B., Jr. "Problems Met When Reading Critically in Grades Seven to Ten." Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1961. pp. 226-31.

Jenkins, William A. "Developing Competence in Reading in Literature." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 145-52.

Kinder, Robert Farrar. "Encouraging Personal Reading in Junior High School." International Reading Association. Proceedings of the Annual Convention, Vistas in Reading, XI, Part 1. Newark, 1967. 417-19.

Lucar, Jan. "Initiating a Developmental Reading Program in High School." International Reading Association. Proceedings of the Annual Convention, Vistas in Reading, XI, Part 1. Newark, 1967. 42-45.

McBride, Mary, Sister. "Meeting Current Needs in Grades Nine through Fourteen." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 17-20.

McSwain, E. T. "The Vital Role of Reading in This Complex Society." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 1-8.

Mersand, Joseph. "How Can We Help Students Enjoy Literature?" Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1961. pp. 357-76.

Moe, Ivern L., and Nania, Frank. "Reading Deficiencies Among Able Pupils." Improving Reading in Secondary Schools. Edited by Lawrence E. Hafner. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967. pp. 162-65.

Penty, Ruth C. "Reading Ability and High School Drop-outs." Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1961. pp. 176-80.

Pooley, Robert C. "Evaluation of Current Practices in Grouping Pupils ... in Junior and Senior High Schools." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Eleventh Annual Conference, Basic Instruction in Reading in Elementary and High Schools, X. Chicago, 1948. pp. 60-64.

Robbins, Ruth. "An All-School Effort to Improve Instruction in Critical and Creative Reading." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-ninth Annual Conference, Reading: Seventy-five Years of Progress, XXVIII. Chicago, 1966. 207-110.

Robinson, H. Alan. "Preface." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. v-viii.

Robinson, Helen M. "Looking Ahead in Reading." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 217-28.

Ross, Ramon Royal. "... Of Reading." Convention Concerns ... 1970. Report of the Sixtieth Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English. Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1970. p. 23.

Russell, David H. "Impact of Reading on the Personal Development of Young People in Secondary School." Improving Reading in Secondary Schools. Edited by Lawrence E. Hafner. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967. pp. 19-28.

_____. "Reading Research That Makes a Difference." Readings on Reading Instruction. Edited by Albert J. Harris. New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 1963. pp. 28-32.

Sheldon, William D. "Reading Instruction in Junior High School." National Society for the Study of Education. Development In and Through Reading, 1961. Sixtieth Yearbook of the Society, Part 1. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961. 305-19.

Smith, Helen K. "The Development of Effective, Flexible Readers." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 159-68.

Smith, Nila Banton. "Reading: Seventy-five Years of Progress." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-ninth Annual Conference, Reading: Seventy-five Years of Progress, XXVIII. Chicago, 1966. 3-12.

_____. "What Have We Accomplished in Reading -- A Review of the Past Fifty Years." Readings on Reading Instruction. Edited by Albert J. Harris. New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 1963. pp. 5-17.

Sohn, David A. "The Use of Paperbacks for Improving Reading." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 91-95.

Spache, George D. "Are We Teaching Reading?" Readings on Reading Instruction. Edited by Albert J. Harris. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963. pp. 25-28.

Strang, Ruth. "Present Status of Reading Instruction." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 206-16.

_____. "Teaching Reading, An Essential Part of Teaching English." Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1961. pp. 351-57.

Summers, Edward G. "New Developments in High-School and College Reading." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Twenty-eighth Annual Conference, Recent Developments in Reading, XXVII. Chicago, 1965. 85-88.

_____. "Review of Recent Research in Reading in Content Subjects at the Junior High School Level." International Reading Association. Proceedings of the Annual Convention, Improvement of Reading through Classroom Practices, IX. Newark, 1964. 38-41.

Weeks, Ruth Mary. "Nature and Extent of Reading in Content Fields in Secondary Schools in Literature." Conference on Reading. Proceedings of Eighth Annual Conference, Improving Reading in Content Fields, VIII. Chicago, 1946. 22-27.

Whipple, Gertrude. "What Is a Good Reading Program?" Readings on Reading Instruction. Edited by Albert J. Harris. New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 1963. pp. 17-21.

Wiltse, Earle W. "Improving the Quality of Reading Instruction Throughout a School System." Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1961. pp. 35-41.

Witty, Paul. "Current Role and Effectiveness of Reading Ability Among Youth." National Society for the Study of Education. Reading in the High School and College. 1948. Forth-seventh Yearbook of the Society, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948. 8-26.

_____. "Reading Material for Superior Readers." Readings on Reading Instruction. Edited by Albert J. Harris. New York: David McKay Company, Inc. 1963. pp. 427-34.

_____. "What Experiences, Activities, and Materials are Helpful in a Developmental Reading Program?" Reading in the Secondary Schools. Edited by M. Jerry Weiss. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc. 1961. pp. 60-68.

Articles in Journals, Magazines, and Newspapers

Allen, James E., Jr. "The Right to Read -- Target for the 70's." Journal of Reading, XIII (November, 1969), 94-101.

Arnold, Arnold. "Reading Failure Far Reaching." Tulsa World. March 21, 1971. p. 25.

Barbe, Walter B. "Establishing Goals for Reading Instruction." The Oklahoma Reader, VI (February, 1971), 8-9, 24.

Berkey, Sally, and Fields, Irwin H. "Reading and Study Skills Program." Journal of Secondary Education, XXXVI (April, 1961), 197-202.

Blount, Nathan S. "Summary of Investigations Relating to the English Language Arts in Secondary Education: 1966." English Journal, LVI (May, 1967). 681-96.

Caldwell, Margueritte, J. "Who Speaks for Reading?" English Journal, LVI (February, 1967), 245-48.

Campbell, W. E. "Reading Can Be Improved." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, XL (November, 1956), 42-48.

Carriar, Shirley M. "Teaching Reading Skills in Junior High School." English Journal, LVIII (December, 1969), 1357-61.

Cawelti, Gordon L. "Reading Improvement Programs in Selected Midwestern High Schools." The Reading Teacher, XVII (September, 1963), 36-37.

Dempsey, David. "The Right to Read." Saturday Review, April 17, 1971, pp. 22-23.

Devine, Thomas G. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Materials for Teaching Reading?" English Journal, LVIII (September, 1969), 847-52.

Diederich, Paul B. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Evaluation in Reading?" English Journal, LVIII (September, 1969), 853-68.

Early, Margaret J. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Successful Reading Programs?" English Journal, LVIII (April, 1969), 534-46.

Farr, Roger; Laffey, James; and Brown, Rexel. "Secondary Reading Programs in Indiana: Status and Needs." Journal of Reading, XIII (January, 1970), 269-74, 317-19.

Graham, H. V. "Present Practices in Reading Programs in Secondary Schools in California." Journal of Reading, XII (April, 1969) 563-68.

Grant, Annette, "Reading What They Wanna Read." New York Times, Book Review. February 21, 1971. pp. 8, 31.

Gunn, Agnella, M. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Reading and the Teacher of English?" English Journal, LVIII (March, 1969), 368-84.

Harris, Albert J. "Research on Some Aspects of Comprehension, Rate, Flexibility, and Study Skills." Journal of Reading, XII (December, 1968), 205-10, 258-59.

_____. "Summary of Research in Reading." Journal of Educational Research, LX (February, 1966), 243-68.

Huus, Dr. Helen. "Creative Reading." The Oklahoma Reader, VI (February, 1971), 4-8.

Karlin, Robert. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Reading and the High School Student?" English Journal, LVIII (March, 1969), 386-95.

Kottmeyer, William. "Improving Reading Instruction in the St. Louis Schools." Elementary School Journal, XLV (September, 1944), 33-38.

McCullough, Constance M. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Practices in Teaching Reading?" English Journal, LVIII (May, 1969), 688-706.

Martin, William R. "A New Look at Secondary School Reading Programs in the Upper Midwest." Journal of Reading, XII (March, 1969), 467-70, 512-13.

Mathews, Virginia H. "Making the Right to Read Real." Scholastic Teacher, December 7, 1970, pp. 6-8.

Moore, Walter J. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Reading in the Content Fields?" English Journal, LVIII (May, 1969), 707-18.

Muskopf, Allen F., and Robinson, H. Alan. "High School Reading -- 1965." Journal of Reading, X (November, 1966) 75-87.

Nasman, Jon G. "A Study of a Reading Improvement Program in the Junior High School." Elementary English, XLIII (April, 1966), 383-85.

Ramsey, Wallace. "The Kentucky Reading Study." The Reading Teacher, XVI (December, 1962), 178-81.

Rogers, Helen Jewett. "Introduction." The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, Improving Reading Instruction in the Secondary School, XXXIV. (February, 1950), 5-6.

Simmons, John S. "The Scope of the Reading Program for Secondary Schools." The Reading Teacher, XVII (September, 1963), 31-35.

_____. "Who is Responsible? The Need for Qualified Supervision of Reading Programs." English Journal, LII (February, 1963), 86-88, 93.

Smith, C. B., and Austin, Mary C. "Conducting a National Study of Title I Reading Programs." Reading Research Quarterly, IV-2 (Winter, 1969), 323-41.

Squire, James R. "What Does Research in Reading Reveal -- About Attitudes Toward Reading?" English Journal, LVIII (April, 1969), 523-33.

Stahl, Betty Lou and Ottenberg, Zetta. "Organization of a Secondary Reading Program for a Middle-Size City System." Journal of Reading, XII (October, 1968), 27-32.

Strom, Ingred M. "Summary of Investigations Relating to the English Language Arts in Secondary Education: 1961-1962." English Journal, LII (February, 1963), 118-136.

Summers, Edward G. "Evaluation of Reading Gains in a Secondary School Reading Laboratory." The Reading Teacher, XVIII (January, 1964), 255-59.

_____. "Reading in the Secondary School." Review of Educational Research, XXXVII (April, 1967), 134-51.

_____, and Laffey, James. "Doctoral Dissertation Research in Reading for 1964." Journal of Reading, X (December, 1966), 169-184, 186.

_____, and Laffey, James. "Doctoral Dissertation Research in Reading for 1964." Journal of Reading, X (January, 1967), 243-257.

_____, and Laffey, James. "Doctoral Dissertation Research in Reading for 1964." Journal of Reading, X (February, 1967), 305-27.

_____, and Laffey, James. "Doctoral Dissertation Research in Reading for 1964." Journal of Reading, X (March, 1967), 383-392.

Weintraub, Samuel; Robinson, Helen M.; Smith, Helen K. "Summaries of Investigations Relating to Reading, July 1, 1968, to June 30, 1969." Reading Research Quarterly, V (Winter, 1970), 131-370.

Witty, Paul, and Brink, William. "Remedial Reading Practices in the Secondary School." Journal of Educational Psychology, XL (April, 1949), 193-205.

Unpublished Materials

K-12 Language Arts Steering Committee. Oral Reading, Tulsa, 1969. (Mimeographed.)

Skinner, Ettalily. Reading a Process, Tulsa, 1969-70. TULSAPAC. (Mimeographed.)

APPENDIX

The following is a copy of the questionnaire used in the study. The figures in parantheses after each response item are numbers or percentages who answered the particular question in a certain way (i. e. by marking A, B, C, D, or E). The percentages have been rounded off to the nearest whole number.

QUESTIONNAIRE

To complete a survey of the extent to which practices of teaching reading are followed in the Tulsa junior high school English classes, your cooperation is solicited. It will take only a few minutes of your time to answer the questions attached, and your responses will be appreciated. This questionnaire is to be answered anonymously, so do not sign it. Please answer every question.

Directions:

For each question, please circle the letter of the group of words which best completes the sentence or answers the question. In some instances, more than one answer may be circled, and in a few, the answers are to be ranked. In the latter case, the numbers 1, 2, 3, etc., should be placed beside the letter of the answer in the order of importance.

1. In what grade do you teach?

A.	7 (29)	A & B	(7)
B.	8 (20)	B & C	(9)
C.	9 (25)	A & C	(1)
		A, B & C	(1)

2. What is the approximate enrollment in your school?

A.	Under 200 (1)	D.	1000-1999 (41)
B.	200-499 (3)	No answer.	(2)
C.	500-999 (45)		

3. How many years of teaching experience have you had, including the current year?

A.	1 year	(5)	D.	7-10 years	(21)
B.	2 or 3 years	(21)	E.	More than 10 years	(22)
C.	4-6 years	(23)			

4. In your school are there consultations on reading between teachers of English and teachers of other disciplines?

A.	Never	(36%)	C.	Occasionally	(32%)
B.	Rarely	(32%)	D.	Regularly	(0%)

5. In meetings of your English Department, how frequently is there pre-planned and systematic discussion of the reading program of your school?

A.	Frequent enough to justify considering reading one of the major concerns of the English Department.	(19%)
B.	Occasionally, but not so frequently as in A.	(25%)
C.	Rarely or never.	(41%)
D.	English Department meets so infrequently that this point is not very meaningful.	(13%)
E.	Do not know.	(2%)

6. Indicate the approximate percentage of your class membership that you consider to be retarded readers at this time.

A.	None	(0)	E.	75 per cent	(8)
B.	10 per cent	(37)	F.	100 per cent	(2)
C.	25 per cent	(20)	G.	Do not know	(0)
D.	50 per cent	(25)			

7. If you have retarded readers in your classes, are you able, when you make reading assignments, to have them read selections on their instructional reading level?

A.	Never	(12%)	D.	Regularly	(32%)
B.	Rarely	(13%)	E.	Do not have retarted readers	(0%)
C.	Occasionally	(43%)	F.	Do not know	(0%)

8. Do you consider the scores on standardized reading tests to be reflective of

A. the level beyond that on which the student should be taught? (15%)

B. the level on which the student should be taught? (25%)
C. the level on which the student should read independently? (45%)
D. unknown interpretation? (15%)

9. Prior to instruction, should a diagnosis of the students' reading level and needs (you may circle more than one response)

A. be made by teacher-made tests? (13%)
B. be made by standard reading tests? (40%)
A & B (31%)
C. be made with retarded readers but not necessarily with all students? (8%)
D. not be made? (Diagnosis is probably unnecessary) (1%)
C & others (A and/or B and/or C) (7%)

10. Do you believe teaching of reading in the secondary school should be done chiefly by specially trained teachers of reading in separate reading classes?

A. Yes (85%)
B. No (13%)
C. No opinion (2%)

11. Indicate any of the following purposes for which you group students in your classes:

A. Vocabulary development (0%)
B. Language skills development (2%)
C. Reading (11%)
C and Others (30%)
D. Discussion (4%)
E. Class handled as a unit (31%)
E and D. (7%)
Other combinations (15%)

12. Do you consider vocabulary development within your English classes

A. an important and integral part of your program to be taught deliberately and systematically? (66%)
B. only one facet of your program and necessarily taught only to a limited extent? (34%)

13. Do you spend any class time reviewing and developing word recognition aids, such as phonics, structural analysis, syllabication, etc., as a basis for vocabulary development?

A. Never (3%)
B. Rarely (21%)
C. Occasionally (52%)
D. Regularly (24%)

14. If a part of your program is promoting vocabulary growth, using numbers 1, 2, 3, or 4, indicate in the order of importance which of the following you consider most profitable:
(Percentages represent the number placing A, B, or C first)

A. Use of dictionary definitions and word lists (10%)
B. Study of word usage within context of reading selections (74%)
C. Study of affixes, roots, etc. (12%)
D. Does not apply (3%)
Did not rank answers (1%)

15. According to your observations, do you consider time spent in word study to be more profitable

A. when student has completed reading? (4%)
B. prior to reading? (45%)
C. when student comes to unfamiliar word in his reading? (42%)
B & C. (7%)
A, B & C. (2%)

16. Does your preparation of students for reading expository material include questions to be answered?

A. Never (1%)
B. Rarely (12%)
C. Occasionally (46%)
D. Regularly (38%)
E. Do not read expository material (3%)

17. Does your preparation of students for reading a selection include setting up a purpose for the reading?

A. Never (0%)
B. Rarely (2%)
C. Occasionally (20%)
D. Regularly (78%)

18. Does your preparation of students for reading a selection include discussion of background study?

A. Never (0%)
B. Rarely (2%)
C. Occasionally (36%)
D. Regularly (62%)

19. Do you use selections read in class as a basis for assignments in creative activities (writing, drama, etc.)?

A.	Never	(0%)	C.	Occasionally	(51%)
B.	Rarely	(1%)	D.	Regularly	(48%)

20. Do all your students read orally in class?

A.	Never	(1%)	D.	Regularly	(24%)
B.	Rarely	(9%)	E.	Only the good readers	(3%)
C.	Occasionally	(63%)			

21. Using the numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4, indicate the order of importance of the following as bases for the selection of classroom reading materials for your students to study.
(Percentages indicate number placing A, B, C, or D first)

A.	Interest inventory of the students	(58%)
B.	Interests of teacher	(2%)
C.	Material in anthologies	(26%)
D.	Curriculum guides	(14%)

22. To what extent to you design your own teaching programs rather than depending on manuals, kits, etc.?

A.	To great extent	(46%)
B.	To considerable extent	(35%)
C.	To fair extent only	(18%)
D.	To little or no extent	(1%)

23. In your classes, do you use any texts or other materials specifically designed for the development of reading skills? (In answering this question, please do not include literature texts in your consideration.)

A.	Never	(23%)	D.	Regularly	(15%)
B.	Rarely	(20%)	E.	Does not apply	(2%)
C.	Occasionally	(40%)			

24. To what extent in your own English classes do you use materials and devices to increase your students' speed in reading?

A.	To great extent	(2%)
B.	To considerable extent	(13%)
C.	To fair extent only	(33%)
D.	To little or no extent	(52%)

25. In your classes, do you use paper-back books as part of your reading program (e.g. keeping classroom library of paper-backs, distributing lists of good paper-backs, etc.)?

A.	Never	(17%)	C.	Occasionally	(32%)
B.	Rarely	(8%)	D.	Regularly	(43%)

26. Do you have a regular period for individualized recreational reading in your classes at the present time?

A.	In all classes	(60%) (55)	C.	In no classes	(15%) (14)
B.	In some classes	(23%) (21)		No reply	(2%) (2)

If you have such a program, please answer Questions 27 through 31. If not, please skip to Question 32.

27. Do your students keep reading records of books read in this period and outside of school?

A.	Yes	(70%)	B.	No	(30%)

28. Do your students give periodic book reports on books read during this period?

A.	Yes	(78%)	B.	No	(22%)

29. If they give book reports, which of the following methods of reporting do they use most frequently?

A.	Formal written	(22)	D.	Informal oral	(22)
B.	Informal written	(27)	E.	Personal reports to teacher	(6)
C.	Formal oral	(14)	F.	Other	(13)
			G.	Do not give book reports	(0)

30. Do you discuss individually with your students books they read?

A.	Never	(6%)	C.	Occasionally	(63%)
B.	Rarely	(18%)	D.	Regularly	(13%)

31. Do you promote your recreational reading program by use of posters, book exhibits, student evaluation cards, etc.?

A.	Never	(8%)	C.	Occasionally	(39%)
B.	Rarely	(21%)	D.	Regularly	(32%)

32. Is specific instruction in the use of the library included in the first year English program of your school?

A. Yes (92%) C. Do not know (2%)
B. No (6%)

33. Have you taught a unit (or similar grouping of learning activities) on the reading of newspapers and/or periodicals one or more times in the last two years?

A. Yes (46%) B. No (54%)

34. Have you taught a unit on propaganda analysis and/or the study of advertisements in the last two years?

A. Yes (30%) B. No (70%)

35. Have you taught a unit on critical reading of non-fiction prose (other than the unit(s) mentioned in the two previous questions)?

A. Yes (33%) B. No (67%)

36. Have you taught a specific unit on a method of reading for the purpose of studying, such as the Survey Q3R method, during the last two years?

A. Yes (37%) B. No (63%)

37. Have you taught a unit on semantics during the last two years?

A. Yes (32%) B. No (68%)

38. Have you taught a unit on study skills during the last two years?

A. Yes (67%) B. No (33%)

39. Which of the following statements most nearly describes the types of materials you use in teaching reading skills?

A. It is almost wholly in the teaching of literature that I teach such skills. (50%)

B. I teach reading skills chiefly in my teaching of literature, but to some extent I teach them also through units on critical reading of non-fiction prose, etc. (27%)

C. In teaching reading skills I use the non-literature components (i.e. such units as those previously mentioned) and the literature components about evenly. (14%)

D. In teaching reading skills I use the non-literature components somewhat more than the literature components. (8%)

E. Does not apply. (1%)

Skip the remaining questions if you do not teach literature at all.

To what extent in your teaching of literature do you deliberately and systematically attempt to develop the following abilities and/or understandings?

40. Ability to determine the author's purpose in the work as a whole.

A. To great extent (27%)
B. To considerable extent (42%)
C. To fair extent only (28%)
D. To little or no extent (3%)

41. Understanding that the sentiments, beliefs, and attitudes expressed by the supposed speakers or writers and other characters in a piece of literature are not necessarily the actual sentiments, etc., of the author himself.

A. To great extent (14%)
B. To considerable extent (36%)
C. To fair extent only (36%)
D. To little or no extent (14%)

42. Ability to detect theme in works appropriate to the particular grade level.

A. To great extent (38%)
B. To considerable extent (51%)
C. To fair extent only (10%)
D. To little or no extent (1%)

43. Ability to distinguish between the denotation and connotation of words in particular contexts.

A. To great extent (20%)
B. To considerable extent (38%)
C. To fair extent only (33%)
D. To little or no extent (9%)

44. Recognition and proper interpretation of figurative language.

A.	To great extent	(21%)
B.	To considerable extent	(50%)
C.	To fair extent only	(24%)
D.	To little or no extent	(5%)

45. Ability to recognize the tone (e.g. ironic) of a literary work.

A.	To great extent	(12%)
B.	To considerable extent	(45%)
C.	To fair extent only	(33%)
D.	To little or no extent	(10%)

46. Ability to project oneself imaginatively into the work and to participate vicariously in the experiences and feelings of characters in stories, plays and poems.

A.	To great extent	(42%)
B.	To considerable extent	(39%)
C.	To fair extent only	(18%)
D.	To little or no extent	(1%)

47. Ability to understand the syntax of sentences in poetry.

A.	To great extent	(10%)
B.	To considerable extent	(24%)
C.	To fair extent only	(44%)
D.	To little or no extent	(22%)

48. Ability and disposition to listen for the sound of poetry, even in one's own "silent" reading.

A.	To great extent	(19%)
B.	To considerable extent	(31%)
C.	To fair extent only	(31%)
D.	To little or no extent	(19%)

49. Ability to recognize the human values implicit in the behavior of story characters.

A.	To great extent	(59%)
B.	To considerable extent	(35%)
C.	To fair extent only	(5%)
D.	To little or no extent	(1%)

Thank you for completing this questionaire. Please return it to me in the enclosed envelope.

Elizabeth Baranoff
Candidate for Professional Diploma
University of Tulsa

ABSTRACT

Baranoff, Elizabeth (Professional Diploma, Education)

A Survey of the Practices of Teaching Reading by English Teachers in the Junior High Schools of Independent School District No. 1, Tulsa County, Oklahoma (100 pp. + vi)

Directed by Professor Marlow A. Markert

(words in abstract 628)

This study surveyed the practices of teaching reading by English teachers in the 21 Tulsa public junior high schools. On April 26, 1971, a 49 item questionnaire was distributed to all teachers whose major assignment was English. Within 30 days, 82 per cent of the questionnaires were returned, or 92 of the 113 teachers contacted. Approximately one half taught in schools of 1000-2000 population and one half, 500-1000. One fourth had taught over 10 years, one fourth, 7-10, one fourth, 4-7.

Questions in the surveying instrument covered eight different aspects of reading instruction, as follows: (1) diagnosis of students' reading abilities,(2) provisions for helping retarded readers,(3) development of vocabulary, (4) materials for reading, (5) promotion of interest and taste in reading, (6) instruction for reading non-literary materials, (7) instruction for reading literature, (8) development of oral reading, speed skills, and creative activities based on reading.

Analysis of results revealed the following facts.

1. Diagnosis. More than 80 per cent of the respondents believed students' reading levels should be diagnosed prior to instruction and favored using standard and/or teacher-made tests; only 15 per cent interpreted standard reading test scores correctly.

2. Retarded Readers. Sixty-five per cent thought reading skills should be taught by reading teachers in special classes, but all had retarded readers in their classes. Approximately 40 per cent were meeting the needs of these readers, supplying them with reading materials on their reading levels, or grouping their students for reading.

3. Vocabulary. More than 80 per cent gave word study in context, prior to or during the reading of a selection; less than 25 per cent reviewed or developed word recognition skills, and less than 70 per cent deliberately and systematically fostered vocabulary development.

4. Materials. Although more than 80 per cent designed their own programs, less than 60 per cent based their choices of selections for reading on interests of students. Approximately 50 per cent used materials designed to develop reading skills or used paper-backs regularly in their classrooms.

5. Interest and Taste. Approximately 70 per cent promoted interest in reading by utilizing the assignment period to provide background information and purpose for reading a selection; less than 40 per cent gave their students questions to be answered in reading expository materials. More than 70 per cent promoted reading through a regular recreational reading program, and most of their students kept reading records of some kind; less than 15 per cent regularly discussed with students books they read and less than 35 per cent used promotional aides, such as book exhibits. Most required book reports of some kind.

6. Non-literary materials. Instruction in the use of the library was given in the schools of more than 90 per cent of the respondents; 70 per cent taught units on study skills; less than 50 per cent taught units on news media, critical reading of non-fiction prose, study-type reading, or semantics.

7. Literature. More than 70 per cent of the teachers stated that they taught reading skills chiefly through the medium of literature, fostering some of the skills necessary, including abilities to determine an author's purpose and theme, to experience vicariously feelings of story characters, to recognize the human values implicit in their behavior, and to understand figurative language; less than 70 per cent helped students to develop abilities to distinguish the author's voice, to identify denotation and connotation of words in context, to recognize tone, and to understand syntax of poetry and respond to its sounds.

8. Others. More than 70 per cent promoted creative activities based on selections read; less than 25 per cent provided opportunities for all their students to read orally or to increase their speed of reading.

Although these teachers reported that they were receiving little help in the teaching of reading through regular consultations on the subject in schoolwide or departmental meetings, they appeared to be teaching reading to some extent and were following generally prescribed methods for so doing. However, in the main, the systematic and deliberate teaching of reading desired by most reading authorities was not present in the classes of the majority of the respondents to this questionnaire. Most failed to see reading in the broad communication sense needed to promote necessary growth in all reading skills among their students.